IMPLEMENTATION OF PROVISIONS OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

FEBRUARY 26, 1987

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

SCNAC-100-1-1

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
73-666 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

H961-46

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(100th Congress)

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MEL LEVINE, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., Florida
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
STAN PARRIS, Virginia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI, New York
STEWART B. McKINNEY, Connecticut
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Wisconsin
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California

Committee Staff

Edward H. Jurith, *Staff Director*
Elliott A. Brown, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

Opening statement of the Honorable Charles B. Rangel, chairman, House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control 1
Opening statement of the Honorable Joseph J. DioGuardi, a U.S. Congressman from the State of New York 2
Opening statement of the Honorable Michael G. Oxley, a U.S. Congressman from the State of Ohio 4
Opening statement of the Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman, ranking minority member, House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control 6
Testimony of Gordon M. Ambach, Commissioner of Education, State of New York and president of the University of the State of New York 6
Testimony of Edward T. Duffy, deputy chief of staff to Illinois Gov. James R. Thompson 10
Testimony of G. Holmes Braddock, member, Dade County, Florida Board of Education and representative, National Association of School Boards 11
Testimony of John P. Walters, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education, accompanied by Thomas Corwin, Acting Director, Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Analysis, Budget Service, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation 27
Prepared statements:
  Chairman Charles B. Rangel 42
  Congressman Benjamin A. Gilman 47
  Gordon M. Ambach 50
  Edward T. Duffy 58
  G. Holmes Braddock 63
  John P. Walters 74
Submissions for the record:
  Statement of The Americans for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment 87
  Statement of The National Association of State Boards of Education 91
  Letter from Chairman Rangel to Secretary of Education Bennett and reply 97

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROVISIONS OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1987

House of Representatives,
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control,
Washington, DC.

The Select Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in room H-313, U.S. Capitol Building, Hon. Charles B. Rangel presiding.

Present: Representatives Benjamin A. Gilman, Joseph J. DioGuardi, E. Clay Shaw, Michael G. Oxley and Lawrence Coughlin.

Staff Present: Edward Jurith, Staff Director; Elliott A. Brown, Minority Staff Director; George Gilbert, Counsel; Barbara Stolz, Ph.D., Professional Staff; Mike Kelley, Counsel; Jim Lawrence, Minority Professional Staff; Rebecca Hedlund, Finance/Administrative Officer.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Mr. Rangel. Good morning. Today, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse begins a series of oversight hearings. Last year, we had a pretty historic piece of legislation that provided nearly $1.7 billion in new Federal funds. Of course this goes to State and local law enforcement, international interdiction, new trade and foreign aid assistance, Federal law enforcement. But I guess most people agree that one of the things we're most proud of is the fact that we concentrated on demand reduction and prevention and education.

We have been charged with the responsibility as a Select Committee and not as a legislative committee to provide oversight on this piece of legislation, and many of its important points have been incorporated in the omnibus bill.

Now, I can't tell you how disappointed I am that the Secretary of Education could not be with us. It's my understanding that he's out of Washington, and if I had known of this, quite honestly, I would have rearranged the hearing to accommodate the Secretary.

In any event, I'm directing staff to contact the Office of the Secretary to see when his schedule will permit him to meet with the committee, either formally or informally, so that we'll be able to get the thrust of the leadership that we should expect from this part of government.

Before I listen to the members of our panel that have studied the bill, and who truly will be our frontline troops in this battle, you should know that this Administration has resisted any monies appropriated by this Congress for the purpose of drug education. And at the very closing end of the legislative section, the President indicated that he would request $100 million.

As you know, the Congress appropriated in the first year, $200 million, and then another $250 million the following year.

Secretary Bennett's position has been constantly that we don't need any money, even prior to the $100 million. What we need is a get tough policy. That Federal policy was enunciated by him saying if you're addicted, kick him out of school and you just have to respond in that way.

Of course, since that time, they've put together a booklet which has been acclaimed by many in the field. But notwithstanding that, the President, with great fanfare, signed this bill, and in the State of the Union message indicated that there is nothing more important to him than education in this area.

Now, the Office of Management and Budget—I'd like to point out that this bill was not put together the way we normally put together a bill. Normally, the Executive Branch, whether they like it or not, give you directions as to even if they oppose it, that this would be the better way to handle it.

But the opposition on the Executive level did not give us the guidance that was necessary, because they opposed the concept.

Nevertheless, the OMB, and we say that because the President hasn't commented on it, has reduced the amount of $250 million for 1988 to $100 million saying that they already know that you can't handle it. I don't know. Maybe they're right. Maybe we don't need anything for 1988. But it just seems to me that before we find out what happened in 1987, we can't really determine what we will need either more or less in 1988.

We think we're doing the right thing. Of course, we may not be. It may not be an area for you people or education. Maybe it's too much money. Maybe it's a local and State problem. Maybe you don't need any Federal interference. We don't know.

But we knew that we had to have an omnibus bill. We passed it. We don't know whether it's the right bill. We don't know what changes have to be made. But you are the frontline troops and we're going to be constantly in touch with you to say, to ask you for directions as to whether or not we should change this bill or what we should do.

I yield to my colleagues for any opening statements they may want to make at this time.

[The written opening statement of Mr. Rangel appears on p. 42.]

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI, A UNITED STATES CONGRESSMAN FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. DioGuardi. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, share your chagrin and disgust at the way the funds are not flowing. It is obvious that the drugs are flowing much faster than the funds.

Now, we did declare war on drugs last year. But what we've done is we've handed out guns without ammunition. And we're nowhere even beginning this war.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to be here. At 10:30 I begin a hearing in the Coast Guard Subcommittee, and Merchant Marine, and it's my first committee hearing, and I will be leaving early because I'm concerned equally about the cuts in funding to that agency dealing with interdiction. I know that you also feel strongly about that.

I commend you and Mr. Gilman for focusing attention today on the urgent need to get the funds appropriated under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. We have to get these funds out onto the streets where they can begin to do some good.

Today we address ourselves to the pressing need to get those funds slated by Congress for education into our schools and impact the daily decisions facing children regarding the legal use of drugs.

This is a matter that has been of great concern to me. I have written to Secretary of Education William Bennett urging that the funds we appropriated last October in emergency fashion be allocated to our schools with the same priority that we employed with passing the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. So I share the sentiments of Chairman Rangel on this.

I am hopeful that Commissioner Ambach and Secretary Bennett's Special Assistant, Mr. Walters, come to us today with a strategic plan for getting these funds from the Federal Treasury to our local school budgets where they can begin to do some good.

I believe that four months is more than enough time for the agencies involved to have produced reasonable plans for strictly distributing the drug-related funds. If such plans are not submitted to the Select Conmittee today, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that our efforts light a fire under the parties responsible for this inexcusable delay.

When it comes to funds allocated for purposes such as this, I feel strongly that we cannot hold the youth of this country hostage to a budget crisis. We all know there is a crisis when it comes to the fiscal affairs of this country.

The kids did not create that crisis. We did. When it comes to drug money allocated for this purpose or these purposes, I feel we're talking about an investment, as I have all along with any amounts of monies allocated to education, so that we can't look at just the exigencies of the budget process this year or next year, because the costs to society are too great to contemplate in the future if we don't make that investment right now.

Kids dropping out of schools cannot get jobs. Drugs on the street, people lose jobs. Families get broken up and then they become wards of a social welfare system that we all know is not working.

I've toured the motels in my district and I've seen the homeless there. Drugs in many cases are involved with the plight of those people.

So we've got to get to the business of acting on the war on drugs and I agree with Mr. Rangel 100 percent that we've got to get these funds flowing as fast as the drugs if not faster, on the streets, so that we can do some good.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Rangel**. Thank you. Mr. Oxley.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY, A UNITED STATES CONGRESSMAN FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. **Oxley**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess all of this should be put in some kind of context. But, the effort on an omnibus bill last session as you know was a difficult one and a rather rare one at that. And with the efforts of an omnibus bill sometimes we get into a situation as we did on the Floor on the debate on the bill and amendments where it becomes kind of a bidding war or a sky's the limit kind of thing.

I remember for example Congressman Pepper's amendment that basically went through very quickly in a matter of minutes that added several million dollars to the bill that had already been crafted by several of the standing committees, with some input from our committee. And I think a lot of us at least felt that we were in the age-old problem of finding a solution or looking for a solution with pouring more and more dollars towards that solution and I think a lot of us felt that with the Pepper amendment and some of the other amendments that passed in a flurry on the floor with very little debate and really no effort to try to vote it to a moderate level because obviously we were in a state of euphoria, I guess, of passing major drug legislation, and sometimes when that happens we tend to get a little carried away. And I suspect that the $250 million appropriation authorization was one of those examples of perhaps the Congress getting a little bit ahead of itself with——

Mr. **Rangel**. If the gentleman would yield on that point.

Mr. **Oxley**. Of course.

Mr. **Rangel**. There's no question that the gentleman is 100 percent correct as relates to other parts of the bill. But in the education component of the bill, in the House bill before debate was $300 million. That was dramatically reduced to $200 million. In addition to that, out of this committee, I don't know how many co-sponsors we had in the House in the bill that we had, we allocated $100 million just for elementary and secondary schools, not taking into consideration the broader scope of the House passed bill, so that where we did increase across the board in many areas, it was not in the area of education that we increased it on the floor. There were no amendments that increased our bill on the floor. Indeed, it was reduced on the floor.

Mr. **Oxley**. If I'm not mistaken, however, the request, even this budget request, is more than we're currently spending in the education field, and I think the Secretary indicated that the last time he was here.

I too had hoped that the Secretary would be here, because I think he made an eloquent presentation of what the Federal Government can and cannot do in this area and I simply would echo the Chairman's desire to have the Secretary the next time he's available, and I'm sure that Mr. Walters will be an adequate replacement, but I would like to hear from Secretary Bennett.

As far as the funds are concerned, in Ohio at least we've been apparently relatively fortunate compared to New York, because the funds indeed have flowed to Ohio and some of the expedited procedures that were taken would indicate at least from my sources in Ohio that we have done relatively well in terms of having some of that money allocated in the State of Ohio.

And I think to that extent we should be thankful.

The real effort here I think has to be a team effort, and I would hope that we could continue to work with the Department and with the other various departments that are involved in this thing to indeed bring about the will of the Congress and the Administration as to what we want to do.

But I think clearly, and I would hope that these gentlemen as well as the Department would indicate that there is a somewhat limited role that the Federal Government can play in this entire situation. The same kind of thing with Federal aid to education which represents a minute percentage of aid to primary and secondary education in the country. I think that the same can be said in the drug area as well, and that we best determine how we can spend that money more effectively than we have perhaps in the past. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Okay. Thank you.

I'd just like to say to the gentleman that the thrust of my opening statement is pleading with the Administration to work with the Congress and to give us direction so that we do not legislate in a vacuum.

But I said that without fear of contradiction that we were fought every step of the way in every part of our omnibus bill by the Administration until such time as we had the White House ceremony to sign the legislation on the eve of the election.

And so what I'm saying today is that it is the law of the land regardless of what their previous testimony was as to what the Federal role should be.

That being so, we hope that we will get an appraisal as to how the law is working and what recommendations they will have, even to change the law.

But I think the gentleman from Ohio would know that this is what we were asking for in the hearings before we passed the bill.

Mr. OXLEY. Well, I think the Secretary was very up front in his——

Mr. RANGEL. In saying he didn't want anything.

Mr. OXLEY [continuing]. Comments. Well, he didn't exactly say that, but he clearly said there is a reduced or at least a limited Federal role, and I think most of us would tend to agree with that.

Mr. RANGEL. When the Secretary appeared before us, there was evidence of $3 million out of a $15 or $16 billion educational budget was being spent for drugs. At no time did I hear the Secretary indicate that he wanted a larger figure.

Prior to the time that the House and Senate got together and passed the bill, the President invited the House and Senate leaders to the White House. At that time, the President suggested $100 million. But we did not get that from the Secretary of Education in his testimony in front of this House, in front of this Committee.

Mr. OXLEY. I would assume that that figure wasn't picked out of the air. It probably did come from the Secretary in his conversations with the President.

Mr. **Rangel.** I don't have any problem in what they say when they talk with each other, but I'm saying it was not shared with our Committee.

The Chair welcomes the presence of my co-partner, Congressman Ben Gilman. We've all made our opening statements and we're anxious to listen to our panel of witnesses.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Mr. **Gilman.** Mr. Chairman, I thank you. I regrettably had a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing on at the same time. But I do want to welcome our distinguished witnesses before us and we are very much concerned about the implementation of the omnibus drug bill that was passed with a great deal of support on both sides of the aisle. And we certainly want to make certain that these funds are being properly channelled so that local governments can take advantage of what we've been trying to do on a national level. And I look forward to your testimony. Thank you.

Mr. **Rangel.** Thank you.

[The written opening statement of Congressman Gilman appears on p. 47.]

Mr. **Rangel.** And let me just thank you witnesses for the input that you gave us before the final bill was drafted, and the constant support that you have given to us. And Mr. Braddock, we appreciate the fact that you bring to us the feeling of our local school boards, and that's where we want it to really go, not some office in Washington, but where you're working.

Mr. Ambach.

TESTIMONY OF GORDON M. AMBACH, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, STATE OF NEW YORK AND PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. **Ambach.** Mr. Chairman, Congressman Gilman and Congressman Oxley, thank you for the opportunity to be with you at this extremely important hearing this morning. May I say right off the bat, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion this is the right federal bill. It's an excellent bill. The key task is to move with all the urgency that we can to flow the funds so that they are reaching teachers and students to improve the circumstance of combatting drug abuse.

Congressman DioGuardi was here earlier. I would say to him our plan for New York has been filed. The issue is to get approval of the Department of Education of that plan. I do not know whether other State plans as yet have been approved, but I'm talking about our plan under Part 2.

Mr. Chairman, with your concurrence, I would like to simply file my statement and then speak from it by way of making three critical points on the oversight you're exercising in the implementation of this act.

Mr. **Rangel.** Without objection, all of the statements of our witnesses this morning will be entered into the record.

Mr. AMBACH. I commend you and your colleagues for what has been done by way of the authorization and the enactment of the act back in October. It was an extraordinarily important Federal statement and Federal committment, not only to education but to the other aspects of combatting drug abuse.

We would have been able to start this program back in late Novenber or in early December. There had to be some steps of application procedures and so on. It is important to note that it was the very end of January at a conference in Washington when the application was put in final form and when the guidances were in final form. It was at that point that States could finish up their applications and forward them, which we did with as great a dispatch as we possibly could. As I said, we're awaiting an approval of that part of the program for New York.

When I met with you last June, concern was expressed that the Federal presence ought to be joined together with local and State actions. I can report to you that after that session, Governor Cuomo allocated a special $550,000 appropriation in New York State which we used immediately for curriculum and in training. We trained 30,000 teachers. Our curriculum was moved to every single teacher in the elementary grades, and all the health education specialists by October of last year. That was an important move. It sets the basis on which we will use the federal funds which have now been authorized.

The three points I would like to make this morning have to do first with the implementation of Part 2; second with a part of the implementation of Part 3; and third, to come back to where you started, Mr. Chairman, with the issue of the cutback or potential cutback of the total dollars for this program.

May I say how important it is for your oversight in this particular program. First, it is new and therefore requires very close surveillance as it starts.

Second, the Secretary has chosen to go the route of not having regulations but in effect guidance, relying upon the statutory provisions. It is especially important the intention of Congress in those statutory provisions is carried through and that there is a constant review and conversation to make certain, in the absence of specific regs, the intent of the statute is carried through.

Now comment on our school based programs, the Part 2 programs. Let's keep this context in mind. In New York we have about 3 million children and 175,000 teachers, not all of whom have a responsibility in this area. We believe all teachers carry a certain obligation as to the messages they convey to students in anti-drug abuse. We have 750 different school districts with our public and nonpublic schools participating.

We are very much concerned that to get the greatest effectiveness of the program, that in certain instances, there are clearly intermediate agencies which must assist in bringing services to teachers and to students. As I point out in my testimony, the median school district in New York State, of those 725, would receive approximately $3,000 under this program.

That makes it essential to get a critical mass for employing personnel and working with those districts that we have an opportunity as was recognized in this bill to provide for intermediate agencies to offer the service.

At several points in the bill, in sections 4103, 4121 and 4124. You have explicitly stated either intermediate agencies or local school districts can provide services. Services still have to be equitably provided on the basis of school age population. But I think you can see that it's going to be very important in many cases to have intermediate organizations providing help.

A third of our districts will have less than a $2,000 allocation. New York City's allocation, at some $2.6 million clearly, is sufficient for a single district to plan and program. In other of the major cities in larger districts amounts of $86,000, $100,000, $125,000 will be allocated. Those are clearly enough for a free standing effort.

In administration of the act and approval of our plan, it is essential for us to have the authority to make arrangements with intermediate agencies for an effective program. I urge that you convey your intent that is what you wanted, and that we administer an effective process using boards of cooperative educational services which already work in a regional capacity with our programs. Our emphasis in this first year will be on training, on building the capacity between the school and the community, in team arrangements for plans in order to move service directly to students.

The second point that I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, has to do with the Part 3 program for post-secondary or higher education institutions. I speak to that because I happen to have responsibility in New York for all the colleges and universities as well as the elementary and secondary schools

Nationwide there is approximately $16 million for two purposes. One is direct services to post secondary students and the second is for post-secondary institutions to provide research and helpful programs of preservice and inservice training, curriculum development, espcially in conjunction with State agencies, for local school districts.

My following comments are, on the basis of staff conversation with the Department of Education, not on any formal release of the department.

I have deep concern about the timetable, because it is our understanding they're not to make those grants until August of this coming year. This means that there is no chance for implementation of some of those projects even before the next academic year begins.

Second, I point out it's our understanding that the administration of that program will be split between two units within the Department of Education. The FIPSE unit which deals usually with special programs of higher education and the OERI, the research unit.

I submit that from the point of view of an agency or an institution such as the University of the State of New York, it would be far, far more efficient to work with one unit in the department rather than two.

I think it would be important for you to get a sense of why the split and whether there will be an efficiency of that split with different timetables, administrators, and so on.

The last point I would make on this program is that again, we understand, it is the department's intention to place a limit of $125,000 on a given project, funded under Part 3. We are now working in New York State with representation from the entire set of 250 institutions—all the publics and all the independents and the proprietary—with the intention of advancing a consortium to offer a service program which would affect all of the institutions.

If we're capped at $125,000, for a project out of that $16 million, it is way down by way of what the percentage or proportion of those funds which ought reasonably to be in the state where we estimate our share to be at least a million and a half dollars of the total.

Second, the cap would impede the potential of a consortium arrangement. We urge that as this program's guidance developes, it not be limited in that way by the size of the grant, the program must recognize that in some cases, it may make a great deal of sense for a larger consortium with a larger sum of a limit if there's any limit to be placed at all.

The third point that I make has to do with the appropriation level. I speak to this not because of a concern solely for the second year, but as much of a concern for the first year of the implementation of this program.

Our plan calls for a very heavy investment in personnel. It is not a matter of moving the money out to buy materials where you can buy one year and you don't buy the next. What we need in this effort is personnel. Those who provide training and those who provide direct service for students. We think that is what you really intend to have in this kind of a program.

You cannot start out in an effort with one level of funding in our State for our schools at $6.8 million and expect that you are going to be able to attract a high level of personnel to make a long term committment to this effort if you also start out by announcing that half of the personnel are going to be in the second year because the funds will drop nationally from 200 to 100 million dollars.

You simply will not be able to start the program affectively with that news. And it isn't a question of what carryover there's going to be. We can use this money. A lot of the effort under this program may well take place in the summer of 1987 when there is an extensive opportunity for training. We can use this money, and whether every nickel is used throughout the country is not really the question in the first year. The issue is what expectation does the school district, an intermediate unit or a State have by way of the program level in the second year and the third year.

You cannot have success in this particular area unless it's a long term commitment, unless it's a long term objective that we have set for ourselves. To fit these most needed Federal funds together with our State and local funds means there has to be a continuing commitment.

I therefore urge that as you act upon the appropriations to provide for us as early as possible a base level with the second year at least as much in the first year and preferably two hundred fifty million dollars. Then everybody implementing the act knows it's going to stay at the same level and that commitments can be made right at the outset of the program.

I thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak. I will be most pleased to respond to questions at the appropriate time.

[The prepared statement of Gordon M. Ambach appears on p. 50.]

Mr. **Rangel**. For Ben Gilman and I it would be helpful if you could give us a memo as to the problems we're having in New York State. I don't want to take the committee's time on that.

Mr. **Ambach**. Certainly.

Mr. **Rangel**. But it would be helpful if you could share with us what we can do to expedite our application.

Mr. **Ambach**. I certainly will.

Mr. **Rangel**. Mr. Duffy from the Governor's Office of Illinois, it's good to see you again, and I'd like to thank you for the record for the input and the insight that you gave our committee in the hearings that we had in your great State. We thank you for making the trip to share your views with us today.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD T. DUFFY, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF TO ILLINOIS GOVERNOR JAMES R. THOMPSON

Mr. **Duffy**. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the other members of this committee for again asking me to come and appear before you. I think what we're doing and what the committee is doing is of vital importance to not only Illinois but to the rest of this Nation.

As you know, last time I appeared before you I was the Director of the State Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse in Illinois. I've now moved into the Governor's office as Deputy Chief of Staff, which I think demonstrates some of the concern and overall impact that Governor James Thompson, places on this issue.

When Governor Thompson gave his most recent inaugural address, he took a departure from an adage that talked about an ounce of prevention being worth a pound of cure. He said that we were now in a position where we needed a pound of prevention and that if we were going to have any impact at all we needed to start focusing a great deal of our efforts on prevention.

Instead of reading my testimony, which I have provided to the Chairman and other members, I would like to echo the remarks of my colleague. Let me focus on one of the issues that my colleague raised with regard to the appropriation for this year, and the suggested appropriation for next year. I agree with what was said but I think there's a couple of additional points that the Committee must be made aware of.

The fact of the matter is that most of us recognize that prevention is not a short term effort. If we're going to have any impact at all on the youngsters that are growing up today, the prevention and education efforts that we put in today are going to go for 10, 15 years or more. And if we aren't prepared to make that commitment, then I don't think what we're doing today is going to have any impact at all. But frankly, we in the States have been going through these short term solutions and bandaid approaches with regard to the different programs that we've offered. We never saw that actually what we needed to do was put together a program that was going to be in place for many, many years.

Essentially what we have to do is begin changing the values not only of the children of our country but of the adults of this country. If we're going to have any effect on that at all, it's a long term process.

The proposal that was made with regard to next year's appropriation level, essentially puts the States in a position where we're telling our school districts and telling those that are involved in this program with us, that we want to make these one-time expenditures. Well as this Congress knows as well as we from the States know if you force programs into one time expenditures, oftentimes those one time expenditures are for things that seem to fit in the program and go along with the guidelines but in fact aren't going to have a long lasting effect.

My colleague mentioned the fact that there's a need to put staff and develop curriculum and take a long term look at this. He is absolutely correct. We can't develop, implement and put in place an effective education program for our youngsters if we don't have the ability to make a long term commitment.

In Illinois, we've made the commitment to finance a portion of those efforts. There is no question that we took a bold step two years ago, in enacting and appropriating a high level of dollars from Illinois general revenue funds, for the sole purpose of a school-based prevention and education initiative. We also clearly created the intent by enacting legislation that mandated our departments, the State Board of Education as well as the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, to coordinate and develop curriculums and have these programs in place for the next several years.

Again, I need to emphasize, if this effort is going to have any kind of effect at all, we need to make a long term commitment.

By the time we see the eradication of the seriousness of the problem that we have today, most of us may be retired from what we're doing right now. But if we're going to establish a decent life and environment for our children of tomorrow, we need to make that commitment today.

I would be happy to answer any questions with regard to specific Illinois programs. I have, of course, provided that in my testimony.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Edward T. Duffy appears on p. 58.]

Mr. RANGEL. Well, we're certainly glad that as a result of our hearing you got promoted.

Mr. DUFFY. If that's the case, I'll be looking forward to another one when I get back.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Braddock, we know how closely you work with the local school boards and we want you to know that even though we're taking your testimony today, we hope to be working with you more closely over the months ahead.

TESTIMONY OF G. HOLMES BRADDOCK, MEMBER, DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. BRADDOCK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, in particular Congressman Clay Shaw, who is a graduate of our high schools. I was in your alma mater yesterday, Clay. The State Education Chairman was in Dade County yesterday, so we visited quite a lot of schools.

Voice. Did he really graduate?

Mr. **Braddock**. Well, he said he did. I was back there at an old-timers reunion last year and he was there. But he was one of the young old-timers.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being here and much of what I say will be an echo of what Gordon Ambach and Ed Duffy have said. But I would like to speak from the perspective of a local board member. I'll try to highlight this. You have a copy of everything. But since I do in a sense represent not only Dade County, and we're the fourth largest district in the Nation with almost a quarter of a million youngsters, I'm also representing the National School Boards Association which represents all the school boards of which there are 15,000, as you probably know, across the country and some 97,000 school board members.

We certainly are in support of the legislation that was passed last year. We recognize as these gentlemen said here the absolute need for this. This is not a school problem only. Now, we have a role to play and we recognize we have a role to play and we're accepting that role. But we cannot solve this problem alone because it is a societal problem. It's not a problem that starts at 8:00 o'clock in the morning when a youngster comes to school and the problem ends at 3:15 when that kid goes home.

This problem is in the society from day one to day of death now. So we have a role to play. But there's no way we can fund this role or do this thing ourselves.

I think all of you know, the role of drugs, you might say in South Florida. We are a port of entry for drugs into this country. But we're not the only system that has drug problems. Be they small systems or big systems, drugs are there.

Certainly we are on the front line and we are maybe those who see it first. But it has not been isolated in Dade County or Broward County which is Congressman Shaw's county. This is across this country.

In Florida alone, drug and alcohol abuse costs $7.4 billion a year, the cost to society of drugs and alcohol. As an example, some quick statistics. And you have these of course, but one out of every six Florida youths report having used cocaine. So if you take a high school of 2,400, that means 400 of them have used cocaine. That's a tremendous number of youngsters. I suspect it may even be higher. Twenty percent of high school seniors report using marijuana. This is in Florida—64 percent of youth arrests are due to the use of, use or abuse of drugs and alcohol. Alcohol rated incidents are the leading cause of death among people age 16 to 24. Families are affected; 520,000 Floridians have alcoholism as an illness. That's roughly one out of every 20 people.

Every alcoholic has a negative impact on society in a number of ways, family, friends, coworkers, and so forth. Thirty-three percent—now listen to this—33 percent of all reported cases in Florica of child abuse are alcohol related. One third of all of them alcohol related. Now, we don't have statistics on drug related abuse cases.

But a third of them are alcohol related; 25 percent of suicides in Florida are alcohol related.

Health care costs are increasing definitely by the use of alcohol.

Law enforcement—in 1983 69,000 Floridians were arrested for driving while under the influence of alcohol.

It was a factor in one-half of the total number of traffic fatalities.

These kinds of statistics go on and on, Mr. Chairman, and they show that alcohol and drug abuse is not solely a school problem but we have our role to play in it.

And I'd like to highlight for a moment a couple programs we're doing in Dade County, because I think you need to know either what's being done or what's being proposed to be done or what maybe can be done because we are the ones who have these youngsters the biggest part of the day and we want to do our part, but we need help as I and these other gentlemen have said.

We're addressing this need both at the elementary level with programs designed to fit the elementary youngster and as well as the senior high youngster.

The Students Against Drunk Driving program we instituted two years ago, we don't know whether this is going to work or not in the way we have it, but we have the parents sign a reciprocal agreement that neither they nor their child will drive while under the influence of alcohol.

Now, we know a lot of them are going to violate that, but it's an attempt as a recognition that if a parent signs the thing saying I'm not going to drive while under the influence and my child won't, maybe it'll have a positive effect. We certainly hope so.

We have a program in junior high that just hit the eighth graders. It's a preventive program.

We started two senior high feeder last programs last year, a program for elementary, junior and senior high, a program with a counselor, a program working with all the community agencies and the Federal agencies for the whole area of the matter of drug abuse and alcohol abuse. It's called a HELP program, Healthy Experiences Leading to Prevention, that's what we call it, another acronym.

But this program to start up costs about $190,000 for two senior high feeder patterns. Of course we had startup costs there.

We estimate that from now on each senior high pattern would cost us $650,000. We have 24 senior high schools in our district. That would mean each ten senior highs would be $650,000 just for this program and our estimated amount of money from this current bill with the $200 million is only $650,000 for Dade County. I don't know what Broward's is, Clay, but we're $650,000. And that $650,000 would just take in a little over one-third of a current program we have going.

We feel as did Mr. Ambach and Mr. Duffy that you simply cannot get long term quality commitment from people in this program if you've got a program that's a one year program. It's simply not going to work.

I've been on my board now 25 years, and of the various kinds of social problems, nothing even approaches the problem of drugs. Nothing approaches the disaster that drugs cause in a school system.

We've started and stopped, as Mr. Duffy said, all kinds of programs. We never do get continuing funding because they have other problems that arise and it becomes a joke with kids because you got a program this year that does this, next year a different program. We need, on a long term commitment basis, as has been said, money to deal with this. The school systems in America simply cannot deal with this society problem by themselves. We cannot deal with it with a few dollars here and there. It's going to be a commitment, I'm convinced, it's not going to be a five or ten year commitment, it may be through the rest of our lifetime and the lifetime of our youngsters, if we don't stop it.

I think it can be stopped, but it will simply not be stopped if you or whoever appropriates $200 million this year, and instead of going to $250 million next year cutting it to $100 million and who knows what it'll be the following year. That will not work. And to reiterate, you cannot attract the kind of people that we need to attract in these programs and as was said here, because then next year half of you are gone.

We've got to have long term commitments from these people. With that, we may have a chance to head this off. We feel certain that it's got to start in the elementary school, and we have a program starting at kindergarten level all the way up, a program we think can be handled at eighth grade level.

Some programs are integrated into the regular curriculum, we have some programs that are separate parts of the curriculum. But whatever the case is, we simply have to have a long term commitment. The average school system spends $3,500 a year on the kids today. We can't keep the kinds of programs that we have to have and try to fund the drug programs ourselves with State and local money. There are too many school districts across this country in areas that have been adversely affected by the economy, layoffs and people, all kinds of things and they're having a hard time just meeting basic reading, writing, arithmetic needs that people don't even realize.

Let me throw a statistic at you that doesn't deal with this but it shows you the problems facing school systems. There are roughly 25,000 high schools in America, but there are only 8,000 certified physics teachers in America. One for every three high schools. If a high school has two, they've taken one from some other high school.

We're worrying about why we can't keep pace with all these other countries. These are some of the kinds of reasons. We've got to address those needs because those are strictly educational needs. The drug need is not strictly educational. It is a society need. We have to be able to address it. We can't do it at State and local level.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, NSBA which I'm representing today and the Dade County Public School System, I'd say we're the fourth largest in the country, are committed to reducing and eliminating abuse of our children's minds and bodies through misuse of drugs and alcohol. I am grateful that the United States Department of Education is providing us with funds to aid us in this battle. But it's only a minute aid.

The problems associated with substance abuse are not just a school problem. This is why NSBA was pleased to see the enactment of the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act in the 99th Congress, and particularly pleased that the Act included an educational component.

To us this signified the recognition of Congress that education is one aspect of a comprehensive Federal assault on substance abuse. We urge the Committee to make every effort to sustain the current Federal funding level in this critical area.

And as your letter said, Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about $100 million reduction, we're really talking about $150 million, because if there had been nothing done we'd have had $250 million.

So when they talk about $100 million, that's hogwash. It's $150 million reduction. And that would just be a start. But it'll be a big help. That it itself will not fund this problem. And I can't urge you enough as a local board member, I've been on my board 25 years, faced every kind of problem from the Marielitos to the Cuban refugees coming in to integration, all the kinds of problems. To me they pale compared with the damaging effects that this has had and is having and will continue to have if we can't stop it and seriously gentlemen, I think you all are the key, people here in Washington, to stopping it because it's such a nationwide problem. We don't patrol our borders. The States don't and the local school boards don't. We aren't the ones that stop the drugs from coming in or try to stop them or do when they get here.

Without your help and I think leadership—and I would just argue with anybody who says it's not a Federal problem. Confound it, it is a Federal problem. And we've got to have your help. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee.

[The prepared statement of G. Holmes Braddock appears on p. 63.]

Mr. Rangel. Thank you. Welcome to Clay Shaw and Larry Coughlin, two of our most outstanding and hardest working members, and I would recognize now Mike Oxley.

Mr. Oxley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ambach, the $550,000, was that an appropriation from your State assembly, and that was kind of like startup in anticipation of the Federal funding?

Mr. Ambach. In fact, it was a continuation. It was an expansion of funds which were already available to the State but it was a special expansion. I brought it up because it came very shortly after a hearing held in New York City and was for materials and for training. It provides for us a base on which we are now ready to move with the Federal funds.

Mr. Oxley. What is your request for the Federal funds at this point, how much?

Mr. Ambach. Well, our total allocation for the State is approximately $10.4 million.

Mr. Oxley. $10.4 million?

Mr. Ambach. That's correct. And that's broken down in different parts. You have 30 percent which is to the Governor's office, you have 70 percent which is available to the State Education Department and in turn a suballocation to the local school districts. But the aggregate is $10.4 million.

Mr. Gilman. How much is for drug education?

Mr. Ambach. All of it.

Mr. GILMAN. But you say some is allocated to the Governor's office. How is that used for drug education?

Mr. AMBACH. It's in the statutory provisions. The statutory provisions are that of the allocation made to the state, 30 percent is provided for the Governor's office and is to be used with agencies particularly working with the Governor's office that have to do with drug or alcohol abuse.

Mr. GILMAN. But what about the school system? I think what Mr. Oxley is trying to get to, how much is actually being expended for education in the schools?

Mr. AMBACH. Education in the schools is the 70 percent of the $10 and a half million dollars.

Mr. GILMAN. So that's seven and a half million dollars——

Mr. AMBACH. Right, seven and a half million dollars apiece. That's further broken down by statute; 90 percent to be focused directly to the local school districts or intermediate agencies. In our State it is $6.8 million; 10 percent or $750,000, is to be used for Statewide programs either of training or of curriculum development or of general support for the local school districts. That's the breakdown, sir.

Mr. OXLEY. I'm glad my friend from New York brought that out because that's precisely what I was trying to get at. Also you mentioned intermediate agency and what are we talking about here in terms of who are they, are they a branch of government?

Mr. AMBACH. Oh, yes. The term intermediate agency I believe was used in this act because it covers a variety of different arrangements in different States.

Let me speak just to New York State. We have what are called Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, BOCES is the acronym for it. A Board of Cooperative Educational Services is in fact a public entity. It is an entity which provides services to several school districts which participate voluntarily. There is a special State aid arrangement and so on. Their functions are primarily in occupational education and special education where there is a low instance of students in need. Their function now is also in some academic areas.

There are 43 BOCES in the State of New York. It is a structure which provides an ideal way for the implementation of this kind of program where you have small school districts, as I pointed out, with allocations which would be $2,000, $3,000, clearly not enough to even buy a staff person. But, if you put ten school districts or more together, you begin to get to the point where you've got resources enough to provide for personnel and a continuing training or assistance program.

That's all authorized you see in the act. My concern is that in the implementation of this act, and moving these funds (as you want them to be moved very rapidly), we get authority for our plan which leans very heavily on the use of these intermediate agencies.

Mr. OXLEY. Let me ask you this. Do you think it was a good idea that the Secretary decided unbureaucratic like to do away with the idea of rules and regulations and simply rely on the statute?

Mr. AMBACH. Yes, I do. I don't fault that at all. I think that choice was made in order to move the program and avoid what would otherwise be delays by way of the timetable. My only point was that since it is a program to be administered without regulations, I think it's important in your oversight role to make certain the administration is being done in accordance with those statutory provisions. I am not here complaining about a decision that has been taken which would deny our application. I'm here urging that the kind of approach we are trying to take which we think is a very effective approach for the use of these funds, will in fact be approved by the Department of Education in accordance with the statutory intent.

Mr. OXLEY. Let me ask each one of you gentlemen, I got the distinct impression from all of your testimony that you were under the impression that the intent of the statute, the Omnibus Drug Bill, was to create a permanent bureaucracy if you will in each State to deal with the drug problem.

That was not my intent when I cast my vote for the bill. My intent was strictly in the area of education, was to supply adequate funds to educate teachers, administrators as to the problems of drug abuse and then allow them to work that into their own individual system without creating a significant bureaucracy that would go on forever. I'd like to hear each one of you comment on that.

Mr. AMBACH. Whether it was an intent for a permanent program, it is very clear that the statute is a three-year program. I think any school district or State has an expectation that you've got at least a three-year program.

Mr. OXLEY. I understand that. But the machinery already exists does it not, I mean, we have, do you have to go out, do you feel that you have to go out in the State of New York and create another job or another function with that money to do what we want to do in the statute?

Mr. AMBACH. Well, when you have money for a program for education, you can put it into plant or facilities, you can put it into materials or you can put it into personnel. Those are the three choices. It's not the intention here to build buildings or structures. It's the intention perhaps to provide some material. But I think the principal intent, when you look at the whole set of purposes here, is to provide personnel service. It may be in a training program, it may be for someone who works directly with children; it may be for someone who works in training teachers; it may be for someone who works at building programs between communities and schools; but they all take people. What I'm trying to point out is that if you start a program where you're expecting an investment in people, you just simply can't start to hire $6.8 million worth in your one year and then say next year there's going to be $3 million worth and expect that you're going to get something effectively done.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Duffy?

Mr. DUFFY. I don't think we believed that we were creating a bureaucracy in terms of that's what the intent of the Act was. I think clearly how we looked at it was it was the first time that Congress had recognized that in order to deal with the problem you had to deal with law enforcement, the treatment community, as well as education. For years past, and Mr. Oxley and I have been members of this committee, we have been putting substantial significant dollars in this problem for many, many years. And let's face it, it hasn't worked. We either focus——

Mr. GILMAN. Would the gentleman yield? How much has Illinois put in last year in drug education?

Mr. DUFFY. $4 million.

Mr. GILMAN. Actual education?

Mr. DUFFY. That's correct.

Mr. GILMAN. How much did New York put in last year?

Mr. DUFFY. Sir, we talked about this in June, in the sense that it depends upon whether you have a separately earmarked category.

Mr. GILMAN. Just for education. We're not talking about the agencies——

Mr. DUFFY. I know that. But I'm saying if you wanted me to add up salaries for all the health educators who are involved and what portion of that is from the State, we are getting up into millions and millions of dollars. I don't want to give you a figure off the top of my head.

Mr. GILMAN. Last year when you testified you said it was about $140,000 to $150,000 for drug education.

Mr. DUFFY. That was very specific for curriculum materials at the State level. Now, that was not for purposes of how much goes into salaries of those who are involved in help with drug education.

But you're right, it was——

Mr. GILMAN. The budget was——

Mr. DUFFY. The budget was in fact less than a couple hundred thousand, specifically on this. And as I pointed out, at the beginning, then, we had a supplement at $550 thousand which was explicitly for these materials.

Mr. GILMAN. But that supplement is just recent?

Mr. DUFFY. That's right.

Mr. GILMAN. In Illinois your $10 million, or $4 million was used for——

Mr. DUFFY. That's grant money directly related to prevention and education.

Mr. GILMAN. Then we're getting into another category. How much did you allocate for education, for educating the kids?

Mr. DUFFY. It's difficult to separate prevention and education, because educating prevents it and that's how we proceed in Illinois. So pardon me——

Mr. GILMAN. How much went into the school system?

Mr. DUFFY. The school system itself there is approximately $2.5 to $2.8 million of the $4 million going into the school system.

However, let me suggest that the purpose behind that is because some kids aren't in the school system anymore and that's part of what we're doing by calling it prevention.

Mr. OXLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If I could get back to Mr. Ambach.

So we're talking in New York State $6.8 million for education.

Mr. AMBACH. Under this Federal act.

Mr. OXLEY. Under the Federal act, for 3 million students.

Mr. AMBACH. That's correct.

Mr. OXLEY. On the surface that seems quite generous to me. Do you think that's an adequate amount of money?

Mr. **Ambach**. A little arithmetic will indicate that you're talking about $2.25 a person. Now, do I think that is adequate? That is hardly adequate for a full drug education program. But I'm not here to try to argue what the total figures should be. I think the purpose of this session is to make the best use of it that we possibly can.

Once you have that kind of per pupil expenditure, I think it becomes clear that what you have to do is to orchestrate that expense to fit together with local resources and State resources for best results. I'm not trying to argue whether it's the exact figure or not, but I certainly would argue that it's a very, very important Federal presence and addition that has been added and you've got to keep it at least at that level to make it effective.

Mr. **Oxley**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Rangel**. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. **Gilman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, first of all, we appreciate your taking the time to be with us and to explore the system and to beef up some of the holes that we may find in it.

I hope that you recognize that what we were trying to do with the legislation was to supplement what you're doing in your individual States, what the school boards are doing in their individual capacities, and not to be the end all or the only funding mechanism.

And I dare say the States have done too little in the past, and I'm pleased to hear Illinois was out front with $2 million. But our own great State of New York and our Commissioner, it hurts to admit it, found difficulty in getting the legislature to supply the funding that was so sorely needed. And incidentally, Mr. Ambach, when I approached some of our State legislators they said it was unbelievable that we are spending that little in educating our youngsters with regard to health needs, a couple hundred thousand out of what is it a $7 billion State education budget? And I was pleased that the Governor finally started turning it around, and I understand you're now allocating some $10 million in New York State for drug education.

Mr. **Ambach**. Plus remember, add what we talked about June, the funds which were involved in the Division of Substance Abuse, in education. There's another 20 million.

Mr. **Gilman**. We recognize that. What I'd like to say is, this is to supplement what the States are doing, it isn't the only funding mechanism. It's intended to motivate the States to help the States in their programs. So when you say it's not enough, we recognize it's not enough but it's intended to supplement and to motivate the States that have not been doing anything to start doing it. And the school boards have not been mandating these programs and the States haven't been mandating them and we hope they start mandating these programs through this process where they will have to come up with some sort of a program plan that will be approved. With no question there are social implications, but the school boards have let this slide to the back burner on too many occasions and I hope, Mr. Braddock, that you'll get the message through to the school boards to start raising that priority.

Yes, it is a social need and yes, we have to attack on many fronts as this legislation intends to do, through eradication, enforcement, interdiction, education and rehabilitation. But the school systems have let us down tremendously throughout the nation in not providing the kind of programs that have been so sorely needed. There has been virtually an absence of education programs in most of our States today. And our good New York State is typical of what was happening throughout the Union today. There has been very little mandated programs and very little teacher training to provide that kind of program.

Let me say this. We in this committee will certainly try to restore the kind of funding that OMB is trying to cut out of this program. We recognize the need for long term funding and that's why we insisted on a three-year period. And we're hoping that through efforts of this committee and the good support that there is on both sides of the aisle in the Congress, that we can restore it and meet the kind of long term planning that you're talking about in order to provide a decent educational program.

I would like to ask just one or two questions with regard—you mentioned the two units that are working. Mr. Chairman, if I might just ask our Federal Assistant Secretary who's sitting in the room, could you identify yourself?

Mr. **Walters**. I'm John Walters.

Mr. **Gilman**. I'm sorry to call you out of order like this, but first of all, a serious question was raised about when the funds would be available. Not until August of 1987, is that correct?

Mr. **Walters**. There are a number of different funding authorities. The money going to the States will be distributed next week. The final nonregulatory guidance is to be mailed to the States tomorrow. It takes into account comments and suggestions we heard from the States when we ran a conference the end of last month and we have already received six applications. I'm not sure whether all of them are in final form, but some of them will be awarded.

Mr. **Gilman**. If I understand you correctly, if the applications are in they'll be funded properly.

Mr. **Walters**. Well, there are certain requirements to complete the applications.

Mr. **Gilman**. But once the applications are completed and are properly in form then you can fund them immediately; is that correct?

Mr. **Walters**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Gilman**. So there wouldn't be a delay to August of 1987?

Mr. **Walters**. No. There are other discretionary programs. The higher education program that I believe Mr. Ambach was referring to.

Mr. **Ambach**. That's right. I wasn't talking about Part 2 there, I was talking about Part 3.

Mr. **Walters**. It requires a different process, it requires application forms go out and be reviewed by the department and then awards made.

Mr. **Gilman**. Will that take until August of 1987?

Mr. **Walters**. We anticipate that awards will be made, yes, at the end of the summer.

Mr. **Gilman**. So then you lose this whole school year?

Mr. **Walters**. Well, the Federal regulations and the law of the land require us to publish regulations and we have to review applications. We took unusual steps with the State money to not require regulations and to use what we thought was appropriate, our standing regulations. But discretionary funds, require competitive applications and this takes a little more time.

Mr. **Gilman**. Is there any way we can cut through all of that paperwork and red tape and make those funds available at an earlier date, as Secretary Bennett I think intended to get this money flowing as quickly as possible as I recall.

Mr. **Walters**. And I believe we're doing that if you look at it case by case. I'll be happy to go through each individual item with you if you'd like now or in another meeting. But I think the problem is if you write a law requiring discretionary grants, it is necessary to accept applications and they have to be reviewed. This is a new program, we have to publish regulations, we have to prepare application materials, and applicants must be given time to write the application, get it in to us prior to making award. That's the way the law is written.

Mr. **Gilman**. We adopted the law in November of last year as I recall and we're now into February and you're telling me that you still have to publish the regulations.

Mr. **Walters**. The regulations will be out for that program next month, yes, sir.

Mr. **Gilman**. I would hope that you would explore ways that you might be able to save some time so these funds could be made available at an earlier date than August of 1987. What about the objection that Mr. Ambach pointed out of ODR and PIPSE? I'm not too familiar with these abbreviations. But do the two units make it an especially complex method of distribution?

Mr. **Walters**. I don't believe so. We divided the two authorized activities, that is the teacher training, training of people in elementary and secondary institutions, outside the university, and the portion of the funds that are directed for campus based prevention programs for higher education institutions themselves. We lodged the campus-based program in the Office of Post-Secondary Education, the office of the Department that deals with programs for universities and in its discretionary program, the Fund for Improvement of Post-secondary Education. That is the office that regularly makes discretionary grants to institutions of higher education.

The second activity, teacher training, was lodged in the Secretary's discretionary fund which is run through the Office of Educational Research Improvement because that office also routinely handles teacher training discretionary grants for math and science and for other academic fields.

Mr. **Gilman**. If I might interrupt, then, you've got two distinct agencies within your department dealing with teacher training, is that correct?

Mr. **Walters**. No, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement is the one that handles the discretionary funds and that program generally handles teacher training. The Fund for Improvement of Post-secondary Education handles programs for campuses themselves. These may include teacher training, or curriculum development, or a variety of other activities that are local to the campuses themselves. We put these new programs in exactly the units that do this kind of work and have regular contact with higher education institutions. This is the most sensible placement of these programs within the Department——

Mr. CORWIN. If I could add something. I'm Tom Corwin. I'm the supporting witness for Mr. Walters this morning. There seems to be an assumption that because we have the programs in two different units, they're not communicating and there's no coordination. That's really not true. We have an oversight group in the Department where the different units that are working on drug education programs are represented and meet regularly and share information. Also, because of the importance which Secretary Bennett attaches to this area, he has three people working directly for him who ride herd over all the different units. They make sure that these units are coordinating, so that we do have a comprehensive approach here.

Mr. GILMAN. Will the teacher training money be going out promptly or is that going to be delayed also until August?

Mr. WALTERS. That's also a discretionary program. The announcement will be published in March and the awards will take approximately the same amount of time. We expect to make grants at the end of the summer, yes.

Mr. GILMAN. So there won't be any teacher training this school year?

Mr. CORWIN. Not necessarily. You could get an award in August and by November you could have a training program, say a two-week intensive program, or a one-month program going on on a campus for teachers from that State. A teacher training program isn't necessarily tracked to the academic year the way a program in the school system probably would be.

Mr. GILMAN. Well am I correct a major part of this program will not be available for the States and local school districts until the fall of this year, is that correct?

Mr. WALTERS. Well, the grants are actually for higher education, but yes, the money will be made available this fall.

Mr. GILMAN. Not until this fall? I guess my time has expired. Thank you——

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Ambach, is your objection that an institution has to file two applications?

Mr. AMBACH. Again, Mr. Chairman, I've been presenting my information on conversations that have been held. My concern is that you've got a program here where you're trying to get a focus on the drug abuse issue and it's in different places, on the collegiate level and at the secondary school level.

Now, it may be that the Secretary can have some kind of an interagency arrangement to solve it. My concern is (1) whether an institution of higher education has to go two different routes to make an application, but more important (2) is a concern that the pieces get separated and somehow thinking about substance abuse issues at post-secondary level gets separated away from thinking about substance abuse issues at the secondary level.

Now it may be there's a persuasive case to use two different units to do it but if that's the case, then I think you need to be certain there's a real close fit between what they're doing. After all it's the same students who move up on that secondary level to the collegiate level and you want to be sure there's a consistency of what happens by way of the overall approach.

My bigger concern on Part 3, Mr. Chairman, is the issue of limitation on the size of any grant. That's really critical. I don't know whether you want to hear Mr. Walters on that or do it later, but that's really my major concern.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to especially welcome Mr. Braddock to this distinguished board this afternoon. Being a member of a school board I think is probably the only truly unselfish public office that anybody can hold. And unlike us, you are not insulated by a thousand miles of distance from your constituents during tough times. I've gone to many school board meetings and I do know that it's got to be the toughest job in politics.

I would like to make note of an amendment that I put on the education appropriations bill last year (H.R. 5233 Appropriation, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for FY 1987) which did speak to the problem of not enough money being spent by State and local governments in the area of education and drug abuse. It is a provision that provides specifically that certain funding under a title of that particular bill would be lost to any educational organization which did not have some type of training.

I'd like to also amplify what Mr. Gilman said with regard to the area of responsibility. We funded this program for two reasons. One is that we did, as you gentlemen have rightly pointed out, recognize the Federal responsibility. But we also were recognizing at that particular time the unwillingness or at least the priorities, the wrong priority that the State and local government had been putting in this area, and our opinion that there was a need for much greater funding than we've had in the past.

Everyone on this committee I think will certainly support the funding of the program as set forth in the bill. I do think, however, in the original authorization bill, that it is necessary for you people to recognize that Federal programs do have a certain life.

So many times we start a program as a startup type of program and with the expectation that State and local government will pick up the slack and that the Federal Government will eventually work its way out once the programs are set up and moving. That doesn't mean they're going to get any cheaper. Indeed experience tells us they get even more expensive as they become more innovative and perhaps even more beneficial.

But I do think in planning your own budgets that you have to look to the day, whether it be after the three-year cycle runs or whether it be after an extension of that, but I think you do have to be prepared to go back and examine the best of your individual programs and start working on whether it be legislature or the taxing authority of which you're a member, on the extra money that's going to be necessary.

Mr. Braddock brought up the point that there's nothing that has been more devastating. I can tell you there is no problem known to any school board in this country that Dade County has not had to deal with over his 25 years on the Board. I saw the coming of the program back when I was a municipal judge in Fort Lauderdale years and years ago and saw it grow to an unbelievable proportion. I know of nothing that threatens the future of this country more than drug abuse and I do think that it has to be a priority on the school budget, it has to come before band, music class, it has to come before anything else. And I think that one of the areas too that we have ignored across the country and one that our Secretary of Education has been speaking out on recently, and that's the question of discipline and the question of what are you going to do with youngsters who are in school that are abusing drugs on a regular basis and are indeed poisoning the people who sit with them in the classroom and see that they remain in the schools while they are constantly being caught and contaminating the water for everybody else.

There's a lot that we have to learn together. There's a lot of new things we have to do. This committee has changed a great deal just within the last year as a result of further examining the way to approach drug problems.

We've come from almost total emphasis on the question of interdiction and law enforcement to the idea that more has to be done in the way of education. You're going to find many friends on this committee but I think that as friends we're going to have to see that each of us carry our own load and I would hope that you would bring that message back to your States and cities so that we can do a better job. We must do a better job.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Braddock**. I appreciate the comments there very much. The local board and the State probably have not done enough, although there most of them are now doing something. We started several years ago. Broward County has one of the best in the country——

Mr. **Shaw**. Yes, sir, they do.

Mr. **Braddock**. As you will recall, when the Nation at Risk report came out, and the school systems of America and the State legislatures of America were under tremendous pressure to try to get us in a competitive—and the President's speech here a month ago on competitiveness, in just the area of academics, which is a responsibility of the school system. You could almost say our sole responsibility.

But this is a problem that transcends all that and the legislation is getting all the monies they can get now, and I argue with them all the time when I appear before them too that they need to be doing more money for these other things but when we don't have the monies to even answer the concerns in Nation at Risk and the Connor Report and all these others, to try to assume that school boards of America are going to have the money to fight this is just plain ludicrous. Anybody that thinks that just does not understand this problem. The seed money for three years—this problem is here now and it's not going to be gone in three years. State and local governments don't have the money now, they're not going to have any significantly greater money in three years. Many of them have all kinds of constitutional caps and everything.

If I thought the problem was going to go away in three years, that's one thing or if you had something you thought you could solve in three years. But we can't solve this in three years, and I don't think anybody thinks we can. And I don't think—Congressman Oxley asked the question and I didn't get to respond to it—did I think—obviously, no. The personnel we're going to hire is these two gentlemen, not personnel to build a bureaucracy. Personnel to deal directly in a drug program or to instruct teachers and counselors or somebody in the drug program.

But this has to be approached from every source and it cannot be done on $2.50 a student.

We're going to have to add tons to that. All we've done today has been local monies and State monies, it's not been Federal monies so we've been doing it all. We've got a problem that's not going to go away in three years. It's not a problem designed to build a bureaucracy, it's a problem designed to get people to deal with these kids that are on drugs and all the kids. You can't teach them one time. It's not a case where you give a kid a program in First Grade and Fourth Grade and say well now I'm through. It's got to be reinforced almost every year, Mr. Ambach paid, up to the senior colleges. They have to have reinforcement of some type first grade, second grade, fifth grade, up the line. Otherwise they get it once, it's gone. Yet you can't wait to give it to them as a senior because it's too late then.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Braddock, you're absolutely correct. I can't argue with anything that you say. I would only add this. We don't have the money either. Both of us are going to have to find it. Whether we squeeze it out of rocks or whatever we do, it is imperative that we find it. We've got some tremendous cuts that are going to be mailed over by the budget committee. We have a budget committee that has raised its own surrender flag before it even had its first hearing on saying that we cannot cope with the question of the deficit and the limitations that Gramm-Rudman has put upon it.

In Florida we do have restraints but we do not have a deficit, thank goodness, because someone way back in our history thought—was smart enough to put it in our constitution. But we're going to have to raise the expenditures at all levels and we're going to have to do more with what we do have, and we are going to have to find new sources of funding.

I would like to ask you if you know how much the State of Florida is spending on drug education now. I know they're getting $6 million out of the bill that we presently have under discussion.

Mr. BRADDOCK. I've not seen it, Congressman, for the same reason Mr. Ambach said. It's spread out so many different ways. We have programs you know that are separate class programs, we have programs that are integrated with everything else, with a regular teacher and a teaching program. I don't have that figure, direct or indirect figure, what the State is doing now. It is doing some but obviously not enough, they're not doing enough in some of these areas that Nation at Risk said we needed to do. So I don't know what it's really doing. We know that out of this bill we're programmed to get about $650,000 and for our county that's, we need it but certainly if you cut that to $300,000 or $325,000 or something next year it would almost devastate the program.

Mr. GILMAN. Would the gentleman yield? How much are you spending now in your county?

Mr. BRADDOCK. On the drug program?

Mr. **Gilman**. On drug education directly for the kids in the schools.

Mr. **Braddock**. Congressman Gilman, I don't know what it is. I say all the programs I recited are programs we're now paying for.

Mr. **Gilman**. I'm talking about drug education, just drug education.

Mr. **Braddock**. In two schools, we have a feeder pattern of $190,000. We have a program with the whole school system, K through 12. Nobody is exempt from the program. I don't know if we have it broken out, it's in their total system, integrated in their total curriculum that we've introduced in there. But just the two programs in two of our feeder patterns of 24, it's $190,000.

Mr. **Rangel**. Thank you very much. We hope that you stay in touch with the committee. Thank you for your contribution.

We'd like to hear from John P. Walters, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education and accompanied by Thomas M. Corwin, who is the Acting Director for Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Analysis in the Budget Service, the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation.

Mr. **Gilman**. Mr. Chairman, while the witnesses are taking their place, it was my understanding that we were going to invite the Secretary of Education to attend and try to fix our schedule to make it convenient for him. Is the Secretary going to be attending this morning?

Mr. **Walters**. The Secretary is in Chicago and traveling to Florida. His schedule did not permit attendance and he sends his regrets. The Chairman indicated that he would like to arrange some opportunity for the Secretary to be here when your schedule and his schedule permit and I'll be happy to try to work that out.

Mr. **Gilman**. Didn't we try to meet his scheduling problems, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. **Rangel**. I don't think we did. I hoped that staff would have done that, but I did say this morning that if they didn't do that we certainly are going to do that in the future.

Mr. **Gilman**. I think it would be important that we meet with the Secretary at some time in the future.

Mr. **Rangel**. It is, Mr. Walters, because the Secretary's absence, put a heavy burden on you as relates to questions that we have that relates to policy dealing with the Education Department. We have no problem at all with the great job that the President and the First Lady are doing in the area of education, and we don't have any problem with the Secretary's position, that is the position before we enacted the legislation that the only way or the best way to handle this problem is to get tough and to get our principals and communities to kick these kids out of school and do what you have to do, but not to have abusers around. We don't have any problem with that. But the Secretary made it abundantly clear to us that he didn't need any money to handle this, that this was not the way to go. We don't have any problem with that being his attitude. However, the Congress sharply disagrees. And the President apparently disagreed when he signed it into law. And obviously, if you've had a chance to hear or read the President's State of the Union Address, he emphasized education in drug prevention.

Now, you people have put out an outstanding pamphlet, and I think it's a model for the world, and I've been sending them out to my district and to a lot of foreigners that want to get it translated. But I hope that today you'll be able to share with us what is the Administration's position now that the President has signed into law a policy that was not his original position and two, how the Secretary could reach the conclusion that we need $150 million less in 1988 when many of your regulations do not lock into place until the Fall of 1987.

Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN P. WALTERS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS CORWIN, ACTING DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL ANALYSIS, BUDGET SERVICE, OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGET AND EVALUATION

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. Chairman, I take it from your earlier remarks my statement will go in the record. It includes a great deal of information about what we're doing in general. I'll try to respond directly to your points and forego summarizing my statement.

Mr. RANGEL. Without objection, the entire statement will be entered into the record.

Mr. WALTERS. Let me begin by saying that I'm aware that I am not the Secretary of Education. But I believe I can answer your questions about the policy of the Department and we will try to arrange a meeting between the Secretary and this committee——

Mr. RANGEL. Let me start by correcting anything that I may have said in my opening statement that was different from the Secretary——

Mr. WALTERS. Yes. I would only disagree with your characterization of the Secretary's and the Department's position about funding, in this sense.

Our emphasis, and it began with the Secretary's directive that we find out what works in drug abuse prevention. It resulted in the publication you named, School Without Drugs. As a follow up to that publication we have started a voluntary school campaign for individual schools and communities to commit themselves to the principles contained in that book and was launched last month.

We're getting a good response, 14 educational groups, parent groups, and law enforcement groups, have co-sponsored that program with the Department. Almost every major education group in the country, law enforcement, parents groups working in prevention is a co-sponsor.

Mr. RANGEL. Is that a voluntary effort?

Mr. WALTERS. It is a voluntary effort by schools.

Mr. RANGEL. How is that disagreeing with anything I said?

Mr. WALTERS. What I'm saying is we have begun with an emphasis on the need to make clear to school personnel and parents and communities that it is not simply a matter of saying that drugs are wrong and harmful. It's also important that we make clear that we mean it, by the policies you identified which are not simply throwing out everybody caught using drugs. That's not what the Secretary has spoken about. But where you have children selling drugs, they are a threat to the school environment and other children. We looked at some programs in districts that worked and found that students caught using drugs should be removed from the classroom, based on that evidence.

Mr. RANGEL. Why don't you tell the Secretary if there's anything we can do to reinforce our support for those principles, we want to get on record to do that. Where we have a big gap in understanding is the feeling of members of Congress and educators around the country that there should be Federal support.

Mr. WALTERS. And that's where I think you didn't adequately describe the Secretary and the Administration's position.

We agree there should be adequate Federal support. After looking at what works, going back to the research and finding out what's effective, we tried to look at how the Department could act in to improve, where appropriate, Federal support. That resulted in a study of our existing regional centers program that we are now completing. They will come up for recompetition and the new act expands their funding. We will be publishing guidelines for the center in March.

But in addition and more importantly our review resulted in a legislative proposal to spend $100 million on a discretionary basis to the States for school districts that demonstrated a need, submitted a plan based on an assessment of the problem of drug use they face in cooperation with the groups we knew from our research, must be involved—parents, law enforcement, school officials, community, and teachers—and demonstrated an indication that they had a workable plan. A plan that involved support by the local and State authorities where appropriate and sought appropriate Federal money that they could justify in the application.

We sought discretionary money. We weren't entirely sure what ultimate level of funding was necessary. We recommended $100 million because that was the best estimate we had and we recommended discretionary funds because we thought it was not advisable to entitle every district whether or not they had a good program, whether or not they were ready to move in this area, whether or not they had effective plans in place to receive funds. We thought that was a better use of Federal money.

Mr. GILMAN. How did you arrive at the $100 million? Just pull that out of the air?

Mr. WALTERS. We made an estimate of approximately how many grants were likely to be sought. It's a guess. We tried to find out what was appropriate with the understanding that if it was inadequate we would come back and request additional money.

Mr. RANGEL. When was this legislative proposal presented to the Congress?

Mr. WALTERS. I don't remember the exact date. Action had first occurred in the House but it was before action had been completed in the Senate and it certainly was before Conference action had occurred. There was a long period, as you will remember because I know you were involved in it, when negotiations were underway between the two chambers. Certainly our proposal was up there at the time.

Mr. RANGEL. You know, Mr. Secretary, that's almost unfair. If I could characterize what you're saying is that after the Congress passed its bill, then the Secretary reflected on our bill and then redrafted a proposal and delivered it to the Senate.

Mr. WALTERS. With all due respect sir, that's unfair.

Mr. RANGEL. I'll ask again, because believe me, it's just trying to get a better understanding. When did the Secretary draft his proposal and present it to the Congress, either House?

Mr. WALTERS. It was part of the Administration package that I believe was introduced in the middle of September.

Mr. RANGEL. Was that after the House passed its bill?

Mr. WALTERS. It was after House action, yes.

Mr. RANGEL. So let me say it again. The Secretary had no proposal until the House of Representatives passed its bill.

Mr. CORWIN. Let me clarify that a little bit. We began work on our proposal probably in late June. I'd have to go back——

Mr. RANGEL. Let me try this again. When did we have hearings that had the Secretary in front of them?

Mr. GILMAN. May 8th.

Mr. RANGEL. On May 8th, there was no embryo of such a proposal.

Mr. WALTERS. But the May 8th hearing also was not a hearing on any House legislation. There was no House package and there were no hearings——

[Simultaneous voices.]

Mr. RANGEL [continuing]. Was no——

Mr. WALTERS [continuing]. On the bill that was passed by this chamber.

Mr. RANGEL. There was no legislation because we wanted to hear from the Administration. Maybe there shouldn't have been legislation. We're not a legislative committee. Maybe our bill—we had a bill, but maybe our bill didn't make sense. So we asked the Secretary, we said you have $3 million—was it $3 million—allocated out of $18 billion. We said, Mr. Secretary, it doesn't make sense to us. What would you have us to do?

Mr. WALTERS. It seems to me Congress appropriates the money. Congress appropriated the $3 million just as much as Congress appropriated the $200 million. So if you want to blame us for not proposing $200 million, I think you also have to take responsibility for the $3 million that was——

Mr. RANGEL. I'm not blaming you for anything. All I'm saying is that it appears as though your testimony Mr. Corwin, is that the only time anything reached the Hill was after the House acted on legislation.

Mr. WALTERS. Yes, but, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, every newspaper that I read from across the political spectrum, after the action on that bill, wrote editorials, critical of speed and precipitousness with which Congress acted. Now, we did the best we could, but I think that it's a little bit unfair to say that the Administration didn't get a bill up here when we did get a bill up here. But the speed and the manner with which that bill was passed, you yourself said last September when I spoke before you in a hearing that you were concerned that the bill was not crafted in the best manner and you wanted to try to fix that this year. That's fine. But if you don't hold hearings on a bill and you move so quickly, it's a little bit unfair to blame the Administration because they——

Mr. **Gilman**. If the gentleman would yield and permit me to interrupt. That bill was in hearings ad infinitum from the beginning of the fall session until we adjourned somewhere in late October. And we had a number of public hearings on that measure. We went back and forth to the Administration on that measure. That measure had the support of both sides of the aisle, and there were hearings on both sides of the aisle in a number of committees, some 12 committees made input into that bill.

Mr. **Walters**. So did the Administration. And so did the Department of Education.

Mr. **Gilman**. We did not hear from the Department of Education with regard to your proposal during those hearings.

Mr. **Rangel**. The Education and Labor Committee had hearings on the House passed bill and we didn't hear from them. Now, you may think we're critical. I thought it was a smart political move to come up with $100 million when you saw that the House was coming up with a billion dollar bill.

Mr. **Walters**. It was not a political move, Mr. Chairman. It was based on an assessment of the need and the appropriate responsibility of the Federal Government, in our judgment. It was not a political move. I think to say that plays into the public perception that the entire issue of drugs, especially last fall, was simply an instance cynical political posturing by people in this town rather than helping our kids who are threatened by drugs in schools.

Mr. **Rangel**. Right. We thought that the President shattered that opinion when he signed the bill, even though we want to work with you to make certain that it wasn't an election year provision when we cut the bill.

Now, I want to refresh your recollection. Were you or your principal invited to the White House to discuss the drug bill with the President?

Mr. **Walters**. We were involved in those talks. I was involved heavily last summer in discussion of the Administration bill.

Mr. **Rangel**. Do you recall when the President invited the leadership of both the House and the Senate? I wasn't invited. So I need your help on this.

Mr. **Walters**. I do recall.

Mr. **Rangel**. Was that the first time that you heard of the $100 million education package?

Mr. **Walters**. No, sir. We had been in discussions within the Administration since July.

Mr. **Rangel**. Now, am I not correct that that was the only offer made by the Administration and that would be supported by the Administration as related to the entire drug package being considered at that time by the House and Senate.

Mr. **Walters**. If I understand your question correctly, that was the only education portion. There are prevention portions in both the Act and the Administration proposal under the HHS sections of the bill for community efforts that involve schools. There is some overlap.

Mr. **Rangel**. But the omnibus bill that was discussed with the President and his people concerned the interdiction, the local and

State law enforcement, the foreign assistance provisions, the rehabilitation provisions, as well as education. And Mr. Walters, the only thing that came out of that meeting was the Administration's education piece.

And so while that may not have been an accurate accounting as to what the thinking was of the Administration politically, it did appear as though when we said we were going to have a bill, the President said come, let us talk about it. I'm prepared to go with $100 million.

Mr. **Walters**. Well, again, I personally participated in discussions within the Administration where we began with draft language from the Department of Education at the direction of Secretary Bennett in July.

Now, there was a need especially given the situation with the budget to try to put together an overall package that integrated all the parts from enforcement to treatment to education, and prevention, and it was a complex operation.

Obviously, the Congress' own experience was that it was a complex operation and some fixing is going to have to be done because the complexities didn't all get resolved last fall. We tried to present a proposal that was appropriate, something we could justify in the case of the education and the other parts of the Administration proposal. We began by looking at our research about what works.

Mr. **Rangel**. Now we got that frustration behind us and I'm glad that the Secretary wasn't here because I wouldn't want him to be angry, and you did well for him.

Now that that's behind us, the President has signed something into law which is a mandate now from your department, isn't it, whether you like it or not? Whether your program was better or not is not really that important. The President has signed something into law.

Mr. **Walters**. And I think if you talk to education officials in this country, who have had contact with us in implementing this law, they will tell you that we have expedited the implementation of this law. We have been forthcoming in providing information on not only how to push the paper, and get the money to the States. If we had written regulations under the normal procedures—where regulations have to be published, commented upon, comments reacted to by the Department, and published in the final form—that money could not have been available to the States for approximately one year. We believed this was an emergency and got the money out quickly and it will be awarded next week. We held a conference to provide information on how it could be used because State education officials told us this was a huge expansion of responsibility for most of them and they sought some guidance on what works. We put that conference on in the middle of the two-day snow storm in January. We met with the State people and provided information.

We got an excellent response from them. The other parts of the law we are implementing as rapidly as the law allows, because it's our belief that the money does no good sitting in the Treasury or in the bureaucracy.

You have to understand—and I believe the members of this committee have enough experience on this to understand—the laws of the land and the regulations that have been promulgated make it difficult to move $200 million divided among a variety of programs in a short time. It takes some time to do it by the book.

Mr. **Rangel**. The illustrations may be ill placed. That's not a part of my problem. I'm going to ask Mr. Gilman to inquire but I want to find out what the philosophy is now that the money is out there, how are we going to follow through, how you just start a program and then talk about cutting it out the next year. I'm not talking about how you got the money out.

Mr. **Gilman**. If I might inquire, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Walters, was it your department's recommendation that the funds be cut back in the second year to $100 million?

Mr. **Walters**. Our budget request is for a $100 million appropriation in FY 1988.

Mr. **Gilman**. You made the recommendation then to the Office of Management and Budget, to cut back the second year of funding?

Mr. **Walters**. I would prefer not to get into discussions between the Department and the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. **Gilman**. Do you approve of the cutback?

Mr. **Walters**. I will defend the cutback, yes, sir.

Mr. **Gilman**. Are you defending the cutback because you feel that that funding, the initial funding cannot be utilized in the second year?

Mr. **Walters**. No. There are two reasons that we are proposing to cut. First, as has already been noted a large chunk of the money, the State money to be requested to local LEA's will not be the local Districts until the latter part of this fiscal year for expenditure. And therefore we expect that the bulk of that money will actually be spent in the next school year. So that much of the $200 million will be spent next year.

Second, we expect that—based on what we've heard from many education officials—a number of them will use the money for nonrecurring expenses. Now it is true that if you hire staff, that is obviously not nonrecurring expense. Some of them will buy curriculum materials, some will engage in teacher training, some of them may be involved in purchasing a variety of items for use by parents or school people or others.

Mr. **Gilman**. Isn't a good portion of the funding though for personnel?

Mr. **Walters**. The money is not restricted in that way. What we have heard from some school people—people in the schools themselves—is that their great fear is that when this money trickles down from the State and Federal Government, a very small number of drops will get to them in the classroom. What happens, despite the claims to the contrary, is a bureaucrat is appointed somewhere, who maybe has the best of intentions. Someone will say, now we need a drug abuse prevention coordinator, another person in the central office, in the State office, in the local office, in the school system.

The money amounts to approximately $2.50 per student. We've also done an examination of the cost of some effective programs. For example, the Anne Arundel County program that we described in some detail in Schools Without Drugs costs approximately $1.60 per student. The Duvall County program in Florida, one that has also been nationally recognized, costs approximately $2.08 per student. The Dade County program, that you heard the witness speak about earlier, costs approximately $5.00 per student.

Now that means that Federal funding at $2.50 a student is covering anywhere from 50 percent to more than 100 percent of their total cost.

We think that effective programs can be measured in terms of the way they act, what they do, how they convey prevention message to students and not in terms of how many dollars are involved. You know, one witness testifies well, we're only going to get $3,000 in some of these medium schools. That's $3,000 serving 120 students.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Walters, if I might interrupt. You heard a Commissioner of Education of one of the largest States, Commissioner Ambach of New York. You heard the gentleman from Illinois who is the Chief of Staff, the Governor's office in Illinois and you heard from the School Board's representative, Mr. Braddock, all indicating that without a long term plan, they are, they have an extremely difficult burden of trying to implement this program, that they can't plan ahead, they can't retain personnel. How do you meet that objection by cutting back the program by one half of the funding that we had proposed in the authorization measure?

Mr. WALTERS. First of all, there are school districts in this country that have effective programs. Not enough, but they don't need the money. But because it's an entitlement, they'll get the money as well. Secondly, I——

Mr. GILMAN. What percentage of our school systems in the country have an effective drug education program, and we've had a number of hearings across this country where there's been virtually no program in any of the States. Can you tell us what percentage of the school systems in our country in your opinion have an effective drug education, because I think our committee would welcome hearing that?

Mr. WALTERS. I cannot give you categorical answer. Less than 1 percent of the high schools in this country have under 6 percent of students who have used drugs. Now, I'm not saying that we have an adequate number. I said we don't have enough. But we have some schools like that in Anne Arundel County——

Mr. GILMAN. You're not answering my questions, Mr. Walters. In your opinion, what percentage of the school system——

Mr. WALTERS. We don't have absolute numbers.

Mr. CORWIN. I think we'd agree with you it's very low, and we'd agree with what you were saying earlier, that the schools have clearly let the students down.

A point to bear in mind though, as Mr. Walters said, the amount of money available now ranges from half to over 100 percent of what it costs to do a good program. We don't believe that our program is supposed to pick up the whole cost. It's supposed to supplement and provide some seed money for what the schools should have been doing all along.

Mr. GILMAN. I think we agree with that premise.

Mr. CORWIN. Seed money should mean you take this and you get something in place that you can carry out after this is over with.

Mr. **Gilman**. But it can't be done in just one short few month period. It needs a program to enable them to get on their feet and get a decent program going, and I submit that giving an initial startup in 1987 and then pulling the rug out from under them in 1988 doesn't accomplish the purpose that we're seeking and that is to encourage the States and local governments to get involved in an effective drug education program. And that's what we're concerned about.

Mr. **Walters**. There are two points we should mention here. And again, the Secretary of Education began by saying I'm concerned about drug abuse, let's find out what works in preventing it.

Then we built our legislative proposals around what works.

Our information is that two points are being ignored here. It is not difficult to create effective prevention programs. It is not a mystery. You do not need an army of professionals. And even if you did, if you wanted them for all 16,000 districts in this country, where exactly are all these professionals that are waiting to be hired by money from the Federal, State or local government? They don't exist.

But the fact is it's not a mystery. It's easy. And we tried to provide the information that people need—parents, community people and teachers—to provide for an effective program.

Second, it does not cost a lot of money. And the discussions about funding levels and ongoing support I think divert us from the fact that what we need is a clear message. We need to supervise our children. The fact of the matter is the profile of the characteristic student drug user in this country is: a middle class kid, both parents in the family, a male, and white. It's not some poor inner city kid that has been abandoned by his folks. But a lot of news stories lead you to believe that. What we have to do is get parents and school officials on track; to be careful about the message they are giving and not to treat this as a story in pharmacology that requires a physician to explain it, but as a story in right and wrong, in being responsible. That's what effective programs look like. And again, they don't cost an enormous amount of money. In places where there is a need for outside funds we want to provide them. That's why we proposed our bill and we said there ought to be Federal funds to help fight this problem and to eliminate excuses.

But for people to say the State of New York is going to pay half a million dollars and the Federal Government is going to pay over $10 million to support prevention programs; for people to say that they can't conduct programs using local funds when the parents of this country say this is the number one problem in schools; when it's their children on the line, when it's the health, the future, and the education of their children, and they say we've got other priorities, we can't spend it on drug abuse prevention? I think someone ought to ask them some hard questions. What's the higher priority?

Mr. **Gilman**. The fact remains that we don't have effective drug education out there throughout the Nation. What we're trying to do here by this program is to provide the incentive and some of the wherewithal to get those programs started and I submit again that you don't do that by first handing out a carrot and then pulling the rug out from under these programs in the second year.

Mr. WALTERS. But you don't do it by handing out money. You do it by handing out information about what works and by providing money where it's needed and when it's going to be expended in a way that will be effective and follow what we know works. That's why we proposed a discretionary program that began with specific provisions and a plan from a locality that would be based on what works.

Mr. GILMAN. You pulled a figure out of the air of $100 million.

Mr. WALTERS. So did Congress pull its figure out of the air.

Mr. GILMAN. We tried to provide a more reasonable amount to help the States based on what they were estimating their cost per student was——

Mr. WALTERS. Look, the Congress provided more. Congressman, with all due respect, Congress just provided more and it cut itself back as the Chairman mentioned from a higher figure in the earlier part of its deliberation. It seems to me it's a little unfair for us to argue over these figures when they're at best estimates and at worst just pulled out of the air in a rush and say that the Administration is somehow morally bankrupt because it's suggesting less money. We proposed a program, and we are implementing the program passed by Congress, and we are proposing an alteration that we think will target the money better and provide economies. If there is a greater need, we'll come back, and request additional funds. There is no question. This President, this Secretary, the First Lady, this Administration are dedicated to fighting drugs. But if the whole fight comes down to how many dollars we can shovel out the door, we are misleading the American people about what works and what's really going to get drugs out of our schools and away from our kids.

Mr. GILMAN. I think that that's an unfair description of what this committee and the Congress is seeking to do. And that's to try to provide some long term planning in the proper drug education program.

Mr. SHAW. I think an observation here is necessary. And I think—my remarks are not at all directed to this committee. This committee has been screaming in the wilderness for years, and I think if it were not for this committee, we wouldn't have had the drug bill.

Why do we really have a drug bill? We have a drug bill because the polls were telling the people in control of this Congress that that was the number one issue in America today. The Congress got together last Fall and picked up legislation that was all over the Hill and had been up here for 10 or 15 years, most of it sponsored by members of this committee, who were getting absolutely nowhere with the legislative committees. They gave them 30 days to come up with a bill. They came up with a bill. Then the Conference session that was held between the House and the Senate in putting this thing together was the most confused Conference I ever participated in—I wouldn't even call it a Conference. It was a meeting down in the Speaker's dining room. We were there.

I would characterize this legislation in two ways. One, the most needed piece of legislation that's probably come out of the Congress in the last ten years and second, probably the worst drawn. And we are going to be spending an inordinate amount of time in putting it together.

And I would like to compliment the Secretary in being very cautious with his regulations. I don't know that I agree with the Secretary on the level of spending. I don't think we're doing enough. I've got an honest disagreement as do the other members of this committee. But I do think for us to go ahead, in the same way now that the Administration is being criticized for the B-1 Bomber, and create a B-1 Bomber in education on drug abuse would be an absolute mistake. I think caution and thriftiness is absolutely necessary. We are going to work, and I'm going to work with my colleagues to try to increase the amount of funding. But I would be very critical of the Secretary if he started shoving the money out and didn't do so in a cautious and prudent manner.

And I'm looking forward to the months and years ahead in trying to refine the bill that we passed. Because the best brains on the Hill so far as I'm concerned sit on this committee.

And I think that this committee, despite the heat of argument which has been very apparent, and I think is very healthy as a matter of fact, that has gone on between the Administration and members of this committee, I think there is a genuine desire to work together and I think everyone's motives are very good and actually they're identical even though we may have some honest disagreement.

Mr. WALTERS. Let me say I did not intend my remarks to be critical of this Committee. The Secretary has been up here and I have been up here speaking to you. I've seen the record of your work. But I am concerned that the discussion has simply focused on money. An issue divides us that shouldn't be the central concern, and we're not discussing the kind of advice, the kind of message we should give, to the extent this Committee and the Department can work together.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, listen, if you want to do a service for the Secretary, you share with him that you've made all these eloquent arguments about your opposition to money and we will accept that, if that's your feeling. And I will accept Mr. Shaw's characterization as to the expertise that was available when we drafted the bill.

But we see absolutely nothing besides a philosophy coming out of the Education Department. Now you're entitled to that philosophy. The President appointed someone that agrees with the philosophy.

But the members of this Congress want to come up with a national program that can be implemented on the local level by the States. Whether you like that concept or not, we want you to evaluate and we want you to take all of the expertise, we want you to take a team approach, we want you to take the leadership, we want to argue with you as to what you are doing and how is it working.

And all this business about shoveling out the money only appears as though you are resisting the President's signing the bill.

I don't care how much you don't like it. I just want to know how you want to improve it, and you don't improve it, saying that you have a guesstimate and so you're going to guess now that you don't need it. You have to come forward, not you, Mr. Corwin, you're from budget.

Mr. CORWIN. That's right. But I'm happy——

Mr. RANGEL. We don't want to talk about budget. We want to talk about what you would think would be a better way to do it with less money, if you want, more money if you want, with the same amount of money if you want. You just come forward with a program that you're proud of and it's going to take more than this excellent document that we are proud of that document. We wish we had more of that type of thing. We want to take the Federal initiative and prod these local people to do what they should be doing. But we just can't say no——

Mr. WALTERS. There are three things that we should mention.

First of all, we will present some amendments to the existing act. They are along the lines of the provisions that were in the original Administration proposal.

Mr. RANGEL. Terrific.

Mr. WALTERS. We will also submit some technical amendments that we think will make the act more workable, given our experience with school people.

Mr. RANGEL. These things would normally go before the Education Committee, but if you share them with us, we'd like to testify if it makes any sense on behalf of them, if this is what we're talking about.

Mr. WALTERS. Third, we'll be using the discretionary monies under the Federal activities authorized by the act to conduct programs that will both provide funds to individual schools and provide additional background material, research, and training to school people.

That will be done under the provisions for Federal activities under the act. I'll be happy to go over with your staff our plans there. Most of them will be published in March in detail.

I cannot believe, given the record of this committee that we are in disagreement on these priorities. And again, it's not my intention to criticize the committee, but it's also not my intention to accept criticism of the Administration and the Department and the Secretary that I believe is unjustified.

Mr. GILMAN. If the Chairman would yield, just one last request again. Whatever we do and whatever program we come up with, we hope that you can expedite it so that the school systems up there can take advantage of it as quickly as possible.

There is a dire need now. We're getting reports that there's new bumper crops out there across the world and that those crops are going to be narcotic products that are going to be flooding our shores very shortly.

We need some decent educational programs and we need them quickly and we need it now.

Mr. RANGEL. We need an evaluation of these programs. We need a mechanism to find out whether what the States have done makes any sense at all.

Mr. CORWIN. There is an evaluation mandated under the Act. It is well underway in our evaluation office.

Mr. RANGEL. But like we said, we didn't know what the heck we were doing. We thresh these things in here. You're supposed to come back now and say look, we're educators, we don't like your approach, but since you've done it to us already, this is the way what you should, this is the accountability factor.

Mr. WALTERS. We have Schools Without Drugs. It tells what's effective. We have "Monitoring the Future" that tells us a lot of students are getting drug education, 72 percent, but almost 60 percent of our students are still using drugs. What's out there is not working. We tried to get information about what works.

Mr. RANGEL [continuing]. This what does work——

Mr. WALTERS. 1,170,000 copies of Schools Without Drugs have been distributed. We get requests for over a thousand copies requested a day.

Mr. RANGEL. I'm talking about what programs, what cities, what States should be proud of what they're doing in this area so that we can go have hearings?

Mr. WALTERS. There are examples in Schools Without Drugs. There are also additional programs that have been contacting the Department given the prominence the Secretary has given to this issue. We get calls from school districts regularly asking for advice and we try to refer them to appropriate people in their area. We are trying to revise the existing centers program to provide more expertise about programs that work.

Mr. RANGEL. Can't you bring those people and train them and make it that you don't have to give out all of this——

Mr. WALTERS. The ones that already are conducting programs that work don't need training.

Mr. RANGEL. For those who don't have it, can't you go out there and train them so we could have——

Mr. WALTERS. There are training mechanisms available. But they can also read the book. It's really not a mystery.

Mr. CORWIN. If I could respond to Mr. Gilman's point, about the urgency of getting the money out. In the time I've been in the Department, which has not been that long, about seven years, a number of programs have been enacted and I've never seen anything implemented with the urgency and the sense of priority that the Secretary has put behind this. The things he has done in terms of putting overall coordination in his own office with Mr. Walters, holding a conference right away to help the States get their applications written properly so we could approve them quickly, foregoing the lengthy and complicated regulatory process, have really put this on the fastest track possible.

It looked at first like we wouldn't get money out to the States, which is 81 percent of the money, until this Summer and would probably have to forego the next year in terms of implementation.

Instead, next week money will be available. People like me have been called into the offices of high-level people in the Department and told: you get that money out, or you'll hear about it. We've done that. Now the States were all in town in January and told how to fill out their applications. As of this morning, we have six applications from the States. Mr. Ambach testified that theirs has been sent out this week, but it's not in the Department yet. Illinois is not in the Department yet.

We're taking this very, very seriously and I hope the other States are working hard on their applications. Until they apply, we can't send them the money.

Mr. **Rangel**. Send us a memo, Mr. Walters, in terms of what you're doing, the problems you may have in getting the money out, because of the language in the bill or whatever problems you've having and also what is very important, and we would have had less problems, if you would tell us what recommendations you would have to make existing law work better.

Mr. **Corwin**. We have drafted technical amendments. There aren't that many instances, with our piece, where poor drafting is inhibiting implementation. I think these amendments have been sent over to OMB and we should be forwarding to the Congress very shortly.

It's not a difficult piece of legislation for OMB to——

Mr. **Rangel**. And you have to write us as though you don't have a problem with OMB.

Mr. **Corwin**. I don't think we have a problem.

Mr. **Rangel**. I don't want OMB writing the recommendations.

Mr. **Walters**. But you understand, sir, that——

Mr. **Rangel**. I understand that you may not and we may not get the money to do it, but you have to write it under the existing law. You can't send to us recommendations from OMB.

Mr. **Walters**. We would be proposing changes to the existing law. We will consult with the Office of Management and Budget on the recommendations we send to the Hill. But——

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay. Somewhere between the line I have to know what are the best educational recommendations and what OMB says, that that's a great idea but we can't——

Mr. **Walters**. I think you're assuming a disagreement here that doesn't exist. I don't think there's any problem between us and the——

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, you had a little difficulty explaining whether you believed in OMB or whether you were defending OMB.

Mr. **Walters**. I am defending the Administration proposal. What I declined to do is to discuss in detail discussions between the Department and other parts of the Administration prior to a formal proposal.

Mr. **Rangel**. You understand my confusion, okay. Do the best you can with what you have to work with and realize we don't have those same restrictions.

Mr. **Corwin**. Sincerely, Congressman, our colleagues at OMB, while they disagree with you on the amount of money, they want the program to work, too.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay. We'll look for that information and we'll work with the Secretary and perhaps then the Secretary will be in a position to support your memo and we will be in a position to show what's important and I think that hearing would be more concrete. If at any time prior to the time we have the hearing your staff people would want to meet with our staff people to see what we could do to expedite those technical corrections, we're very anxious to support it.

Mr. **Walters**. I can also assume that you are satisfied we are not getting the money out too fast or in an inadequate way, because I know you had that fear earlier.

Mr. **Rangel**. I had a problem, and I'm glad you raised it because I wanted to, as to whether or not the Administration was shoveling out the money, you know.

Mr. **Walters**. But you're satisfied having seen the nonregulatory guidance and the procedures——

Mr. **Rangel**. And whether or not there's going to be any accountability. The Secretary wrote and gave assurance that there was enough accountability under existing law that he would not have to put out his own regulations.

Mr. **Corwin**. Under existing regulations.

Mr. **Rangel**. Under existing regulations. But I'm not that familiar with existing regulations. What I would want to see, because the Secretary really demands press presence when he speaks, is that when that money was going out that he would have given one of those statements that we're sending this money out and this is what we expect from local and State people, this is Federal funds, and we expect you to do something. We didn't hear that. All we heard is that he was going to get that money out as soon as possible.

Mr. **Walters**. The reason you didn't hear that is because he made that statement before the State representatives during the two-day snowstorm that closed down this city. He said it, and he said it to the State representatives.

Mr. **Rangel**. The Secretary has more than this year of opportunity for public appearances and I've seen him many, many times since then and he's never really pointed out that we are not just giving the money out here swiftly because the Congress said that it should be out there but the same way he gives the schools hell for not being hard on drugs, the same way he believes that drugs are being condoned by the educators, I would want to hear from him as to and now that you got this money we expect you to show us what you're doing with it because we're going to evalute those programs and we're going to be hard on you if you don't really produce something that warrants this type of expenditure. I am not——

Mr. **Walters**. We will do that. But keep in mind that the legislation in its present form restricts our ability to evaluate and control what those localities do with the money.

There are some limits, but they are not the same measures of accountability that we proposed in the Administration Bill. And one of the things we'll bring back to you as a suggestion is an amendment to the bill that would allow us better control.

Mr. **Rangel**. You're not terribly fair, Mr. Walters because you have to understand that all this stuff you're talking about in the Administration Bill, I'm in the House of Representatives. I have no idea what the heck you're talking about.

The Administration had a bill——

Mr. **Walters**. Members of the House had no idea what the House bill was. We heard that from Congressman Shaw.

Mr. **Rangel**. In any event, what you will have an opportunity to do is to take the so-called Administration bill and to see what is the law of the land and to get those fine ideas that you have and see whether we can incorporate it. How's that for a compromise?

Mr. **Walters**. Fine.

Mr. **Rangel**. And staff will send a list of questions and those could be corrected.

[The prepared statement of John P. Walters appears on p. 74.]

Mr. **Rangel**. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 12:18 p.m., the Select Committee adjourned.]

PREPARED STATEMENTS

OPENING STATEMENT

OF

CHARLES B. RANGEL
Chairman

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Hearing on
Implementation of the
Drug Abuse Education Provisions
of the
Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986

Thursday, February 26, 1987

GOOD MORNING.

TODAY, THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL BEGINS A SERIES OF OVERSIGHT HEARINGS TO EXAMINE WHAT IS BEING DONE TO CARRY OUT THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 (P.L. 99-570).

LAST YEAR, CONGRESS PASSED AND THE PRESIDENT SIGNED INTO LAW THIS MAJOR PIECE OF LEGISLATION THAT FOR THE FIRST TIME PROVIDES A COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL PROGRAM TO ATTACK DRUG TRAFFICKING AND ABUSE.

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 (P.L. 99-570), AND THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION THAT FUNDED IT, PROVIDE NEARLY $1.7 BILLION IN NEW FEDERAL FUNDS TO ATTACK ALL ASPECTS OF THE NATION'S DRUG ABUSE PROBLEM.

THE ACT SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASES RESOURCES FOR FEDERAL DRUG INTERDICTION AND ENFORCEMENT. IT MAKES AVAILABLE SUBSTANTIAL NEW FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR STATE AND LOCAL DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT, TREATMENT, PREVENTION AND EDUCATION EFFORTS. IT INCLUDES ADDITIONAL FUNDING, NEW INCENTIVES AND NEW TRADE AND FOREIGN AID SANCTIONS TO ENCOURAGE GREATER NARCOTICS CONTROL EFFORTS BY FOREIGN DRUG PRODUCING AND TRAFFICKING NATIONS; AND IT PROVIDES A HOST OF NEW LEGAL TOOLS TO FACILITATE INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF DRUG CRIMINALS.

THIS HISTORIC LEGISLATION, ENACTED WITH OVERWHELMING BIPARTISAN SUPPORT AND COOPERATION IN THE CONGRESS, MAKES A GOOD START TOWARD BRINGING DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG TRAFFICKING UNDER CONTROL.

IT IS ONLY A FIRST STEP, HOWEVER. MUCH MORE REMAINS TO BE DONE. CONGRESS NEEDS TO MONITOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACT CAREFULLY TO ENSURE THAT IT IS BEING CARRIED OUT EXPEDITIOUSLY AND EFFECTIVELY AND TO ASSURE THAT APPROPRIATE FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS ARE TAKEN TO SOLIDIFY AND EXPAND THE GAINS THIS LEGISLATION WILL MAKE POSSIBLE.

OUR HEARING TODAY BEGINS THIS PROCESS. WE WILL BE ASKING FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES TO REPORT ON THEIR ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ACT AND TO ASSESS FUTURE NEEDS. ULTIMATELY, WE WANT TO FIND OUT WHAT WORKS, WHAT DOESN'T WORK, WHERE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES ARE NEEDED, AND WHAT NEW PROGRAMS AND AUTHORITIES WOULD ENHANCE OUR EFFORTS.

WE ALSO WANT TO KNOW WHY THE ADMINISTRATION'S 1988 BUDGET PROPOSES SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN THE ANTI-DRUG FUNDING LEVELS ENACTED JUST LAST FALL. THESE CUTS, SUBMITTED WHEN THE PRESIDENT'S SIGNATURE WAS BARELY DRY ON THE NEW ACT AND LONG BEFORE CONGRESS HAD ANY OPPORTUNITY TO EVALUATE THE ACT'S EFFECTIVENESS, RAISE SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION'S COMMITMENT TO DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL EFFORTS.

OUR INITIAL HEARING TODAY FOCUSES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROVISIONS OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT. THESE PROVISIONS ARE, IN A VERY REAL SENSE, THE LINCHPIN OF THE PROGRAM CONGRESS ENACTED LAST YEAR. UNDER THE BEST OF CIRCUMSTANCES, IT WILL TAKE YEARS TO REDUCE THE SUPPLY OF ILLICIT DRUGS AFFECTING OUR CITIES AND COMMUNITIES. DRUGS ARE MORE READILY AVAILABLE, CHEAPER AND PURER THAN EVER BEFORE. EACH YEAR, THE PRODUCTION OF ILLICIT NARCOTIC CROPS ABROAD INCREASES. EACH YEAR, THE AMOUNT OF ILLEGAL DRUGS SMUGGLED INTO AND DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT OUR COUNTRY CONTINUES TO GROW.

IN OUR HEARINGS AROUND THE COUNTRY, WE HAVE SEEN HOW DRUG TRAFFICKING HAS OVERWHELMED LAW ENFORCEMENT. OUR BORDERS ARE A SIEVE AGAINST THE FLOOD OF ILLICIT NARCOTICS TRAFFIC. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS FROM CUSTOMS, COAST GUARD, BORDER PATROL, THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS HAVE TESTIFIED THAT THEIR AGENCIES CAN DO LITTLE TO REDUCE DRUG AVAILABILITY AS LONG AS DEMAND CONTINUES TO GROW. FEDERAL OFFICIALS FROM THE PRESIDENT ON DOWN HAVE BEEN ADAMANT IN THEIR STATEMENTS THAT DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION IS THE ULTIMATE ANSWER TO OUR DRUG CRISIS.

YET, PRIOR TO THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT, THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SPENT ONLY $3 MILLION A YEAR FOR DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION OUT OF A BUDGET OF NEARLY $18 BILLION.

OUR HEARINGS ALSO REVEALED STRONG SUPPORT AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE, SCHOOL-BASED DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAMS. BUT FEW STATES AND LOCALITIES HAVE THE RESOURCES TO MOUNT SUCH EFFORTS.

IN THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986, CONGRESS TOOK ACTION TO TRY TO PROTECT OUR CHILDREN AGAINST THE ONSLAUGHT OF DRUGS. THAT LEGISLATION AUTHORIZES A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATE OUR YOUTH ABOUT THE DANGERS OF DRUGS. CONGRESS INTENDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD PLAY A STRONG LEADERSHIP ROLE IN FOSTERING EFFECTIVE DRUG EDUCATION EFFORTS, PARTICULARLY PROGRAMS IN OUR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. TODAY, WE WANT TO SEE WHAT THE DEPARTMENT IS DOING TO CARRY OUT THIS MANDATE. WE WILL ALSO HEAR THE VIEWS OF SOME STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS WHO WILL BE DEVELOPING AND ADMINISTERING PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE ACT.

BEFORE HEARING FROM OUR WITNESSES, I YIELD TO ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE WHO WISH TO MAKE OPENING STATEMENTS.

STATEMENT
OF
THE
HONORABLE BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

HEARING ON

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROVISIONS

OF THE

ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1987

I FIND IT BOTH FITTING AND IMPORTANT THAT OUR FIRST HEARING ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 FOCUSES ON FEDERAL ANTI-DRUG EDUCATION EFFORTS. FOR YEARS, CONGRESS HAS ADVOCATED AN AGGRESSIVE STANCE ON THIS VITAL ISSUE, WHICH, THANKFULLY, CULMINATED WITH THE CREATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE AND FAR-REACHING MEASURE THAT WAS SIGNED INTO LAW LAST FALL.

IN ITS MANY HEARINGS, BOTH IN WASHINGTON AND AROUND THE COUNTRY, THE SELECT COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN TESTIMONY FROM NUMEROUS INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS WHO ARE STRUGGLING TO COPE WITH THE RISING TIDE OF ILLICIT SUBSTANCE ABUSE. OUR BORDERS ARE BEING FLOODED WITH DRUGS OF EVERY KIND, WHILE PRICE IS DOWN AND PURITY IS UP.

WE HEARD THE OUTCRY THAT SWEPT THROUGH THE URBAN AND RURAL AREAS OF THIS NATION, AND RESPONDED WITH WHAT MANY FEEL IS AN EXCELLENT FIRST STEP IN REDUCING BOTH THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF DRUGS.

YET, I AM DISMAYED AND ANGERED BY THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS, ESPECIALLY IN THE EDUCATION AREA. FOR FISCAL YEAR '88, THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES TO SLASH THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S BUDGET FROM $250 MILLION TO $100 MILLION FOR DRUG ABUSE PROGRAMS.

I FAIL TO UNDERSTAND WHAT BENEFITS CAN BE DERIVED FROM CUTTING A PROGRAM BEFORE IT EVEN STARTS. IT IS LIKE THROWING THE BABY OUT WITH THE BATHWATER.

IF THERE WERE A HISTORY OF INEFFECTIVENESS, OF MISMANAGEMENT, OR OTHER WRONGDOING, IT WOULD BE A DIFFERENT SITUATION REQUIRING A SEPARATE RESPONSE. YET TO WITHHOLD FEDERAL DOLLARS FROM A NEW PROGRAM THAT HAS CLEARLY BEEN DESIGNATED A CONGRESSIONAL AND NATIONAL PRIORITY SEEMS FOOLHARDY AT BEST.

I HOPE THAT THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION CAN ENLIGHTEN US. I ALSO HOPE THAT WITH TODAY'S HEARING, WE WILL BE ABLE TO CONVINCE HIM OTHERWISE.

WE ALSO HAVE WITH US TODAY SEVERAL STATE AND LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES. THEIR PERSPECTIVE IS A VITAL COMPONENT IN THIS "WAR ON DRUGS". I HOPE THAT TODAY'S SESSION CAN BE A FRANK AND CANDID ONE, AND INVITE ALL THE WITNESSES TO SHARE THEIR THOUGHTS WITH THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS FREELY.

######

TESTIMONY OF

GORDON M. AMBACH

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

AND

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS USE AND CONTROL

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES RANGEL, CHAIRMAN

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 26, 1987

Congressman Rangel, members of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. I commend you for your leadership in enacting the "Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986" and in your rigorous oversight of how effectively and expeditiously the act is being implemented. This morning we focus specifically on the drug abuse education provisions of Title IV, known a [illegible] Drug Free Schools and Communities Act.

Your action last fall was taken with the urgency of more Federal action to stop the crisis of drug abuse. That crisis continues, and we must put the Federal programs into action as soon as possible. Since I met with you and members of the Select Committee last summer, our state has taken significant steps in drug and alcohol education. Governor Cuomo provided $550,000 in August for distribution of our State Education Department drug education curriculum to every public and nonpublic elementary school classroom teacher and secondary school health education teacher in the State. Training programs for teachers were launched in the Fall, additional materials were distributed to students and events were conducted throughout the State around the designated "Statewide Drug Awareness Day," October 23. We continue these efforts but we are desperate for added Federal resources to assure our program reaches all students effectively.

The following steps have led to our filing application this week to implement the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act enacted in October, 1986. On November 21, Secretary Bennett informed states of the estimated size of their grants. At the end of December, states received a draft application and nonregulatory guidelines. On January 26 and 27, 1987, representatives of my agency and other state agencies met in Washington to review and discuss the application and guidelines. At that point we had final instruction from the Department of Education to proceed with our state application. This week New York State has applied for funds under Part 2. Our application has been prepared in cooperation with the State Division of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS) and the State Division of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (DAAA) and approved and transmitted by the Governor.

Our application for State funds under Part 2 of the Act proposes using the funds available for the State Educational Agency Program to:

- establish a Statewide, regional training and support network for substance abuse prevention and education;
- develop and implement school district level training programs; and
- provide technical assistance to school district teams in implementing comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse prevention programs.

Our plan concentrates on employing the best available personnel to work directly with the tens of thousands of teachers who have responsibility for substance abuse education to assure they have current information and techniques used in prevention of abuse.

Under the Act, each local school district is entitled to funds or services in amounts related to that district's part of the total State school-age population. The amounts available for our major city school districts will be of such size that each will have its specific program. However, New York State has a large number of school districts with a relatively small pupil population. A median-sized school district would receive about $3,000, one-third of our school districts would receive $2,000 or less. In order to employ effective personnel and make the best use of the Federal funds, our proposed program outside the "Big

Five" city school districts uses the concept of multi-district or regional projects through which a number of school districts pool their entitlements for a more cost effective program impact.

During the first year of the program, the State Education Department (SED) in cooperation with the Division of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS) and the Division of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (DAAA) focuses on training.

A Statewide, regional training and support network of professionals will handle the training program. This support network, trained by the three State agencies, will work with Regional Technical Assistance Units of professionals in alcohol and substance abuse prevention and education located in the five major cities and eleven multi-district regions.

Regional Technical Assistance Units will, in turn, train teachers and administrators. In addition, they will train local school district teams including representatives of the district's school board; administration; teachers; parents and community leaders including those from human and social service agencies, law enforcement agencies, drug and alcohol prevention programs; religious organizations and community and service groups. This team training is essential to develop and implement comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse prevention plans which link the school and community. The goal of each district's plan is to have drug free schools. These plans would include training for all school personnel especially teachers; training for parents so that what is taught at home is consistent with what is taught at school; and work with community and service organizations to identify and obtain support, services, and other resources.

In the second and third years, Regional Technical Assistance Units will provide continuing training and support to the school district teams in plan implementation.

Schools can have a key role in affecting the self-destructive and/or misdirected motivations of young people who engage in drug use and abuse behavior. Schools, however, cannot do this job alone. They must take the initiative of bringing together school, home and community to develop a comprehensive and well-coordinated alcohol and drug abuse prevention program.

Drug and alcohol abuse education is not just teaching facts. Research shows that young people must not only have acquired basic concepts regarding health-related matters to resist drug abuse. They are less likely to abuse alcohol and drugs if they have a positive view of themselves and their ability to exercise a measure of control over their lives; family and friends to turn to in times of stress; rewarding and supportive experiences in schools, with their families, and other social environments; and, experience in making personal decisions with an understanding of the consequences of their behavior.

In our programs to be funded under the Federal act and in our other efforts, we must strive to realize those conditions.

Since our application for funds has been submitted to the Department of Education this week, we have not yet been able to provide local educational agencies with definitive information concerning their applications. We will inform them as soon as we have DOE approval. That approval is especially important with respect to pooling funds among districts.

I would like to comment about Part 3, Section 4131 of the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act which provides for a program a competitive grants to institutions of higher education or consortia of such institutions for drug abuse education and prevention activities. No less than 50 percent of the $16.0 million Congress has appropriated for fiscal year 1987 may be used to develop and implement programs of drug abuse education and prevention for postsecondary students. The remaining funds are available for grants to improve pre- and in-service training of elementary and secondary teachers and drug education curricula.

Implementation of section 4131 is moving more slowly than is the case with other sections of the Act. The Department of Education has not yet provided guidelines for preparation of proposals and grant awards are tentatively scheduled for announcement in August. This would leave practically no time for successful applicant institutions to implement projects at the beginning of academic year 1987-88. We have been monitoring the development of the Department of Education's plan for administration of the higher education grants program and have identified several issues of concern:

- o First, we are concerned that the Department of Education has chosen to split administrative responsibility for this grants program between the Funds for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and the Office for Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). This would appear to impede collaboration and will require institutions interested in both programs to submit two completely separate applications, each with different timelines and requirements.

- o Second, it is our impression that the Department of Education intends to make the widest possible distribution of the limited funding. This policy will result in many small grants. This will make it difficult for recipients to undertake fully comprehensive programs which have the potential for regional or statewide impact or to disseminate information about successful practices. New York State intends to develop consortia applications which would have many institutions and the State Education Department working collaboratively to provide services to students, faculty, and teachers. However, while consortia projects are encouraged under the statute, the anticipated limited size of the grant awards would render them ineffective.

o Finally, we are concerned that the application guidelines and regulations being developed by Department of Education will not identify "need" as a primary criteria for selecting awards. Department of Education staff have indicated that the guidelines and regulations will track statutory language which identifies only geographic spread and diversity in the type and sizes of postsecondary institutions as criteria for selection of awards. We believe "need" or "intensity of problems" should also be a criteria.

We urge your consideration of these points and of the timetable for this program. We are anxious to make application.

The New York State program for elementary and secondary schools which I have described is based on a funding level for years two and three, at least at the level of year one. The President's budget proposed for fiscal year 1988 would reduce funding by 50%, a drastic cut from the amount of $200 million appropriated for 1987 to $100 million. The resulting loss is $5.4 million to New York which would reduce Federal drug education funds in the State from $3.60 per student to $1.80 per student in fiscal year 1988.

We urge the Congress to appropriate at least $200 million for FY 1988. Our program is heavily dependent on employing well-qualified personnel. It is impossible to start a program effectively for one year with the expectation that half the personnel or program will be gone in year two. That proposed reduction would have a crippling effect on both years.

I appreciate the opportunity to share this information about New York State's proposed program.

TESTIMONY OF

EDWARD T. DUFFY
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF
TO ILLINOIS GOVERNOR JAMES R. THOMPSON

Before The

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 26, 1987

Congressman Rangel and distinguished members of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, my name is Ed Duffy and I serve as Deputy Chief of Staff to James R. Thompson, Governor of Illinois. I must first to convey the personal appreciation of Governor Thompson for your interest in hearing about the concerns and views facing Illinois in implementing the new provisions of the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act. I must also convey my own thanks to you and your staff for this kind and important invitation, and to thank you for this opportunity to speak on an issue that is vitally important to us in Illinois.

I had the privilege of appearing before this Committee previously in my role as Director of the Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. At that time, one of our primary concerns was the barriers to communication and information sharing between states and the federal government. In my current role as Deputy Chief of Staff to Governor Thompson, I retain responsibility for coordination of alcohol and drug abuse issues among departments and agencies of state government, and I must still express concern over the lack of communication and understanding of the successes and struggles faced by states.

The extremely promising nature of the law enforcement, treatment and prevention legislation passed by the Congress gave real encouragement to us in Illinois that the State was not waging a lonely struggle against the ravishments of drug and alcohol abuse. Rather, the enactment of the Anti-Drug Abuse legislation last fall makes us confident that we have a partner in the federal government who understands that we were capable of making a difference. To follow the implementation and continuation of this partnership by talking with each other, and recognizing the strengths at both the State and the federal government bring to this effort is of paramount importance, and should not be ignored.

While we realize that today's hearings focus on the education and prevention portions of this vital legislation, I must emphasize that a continuing dialogue between us offers the best and I would speculate, most efficient means of combining our strengths against a formidable enemy.

In speaking to the programs authorized in the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, let me first assure you that this portion of the legislation is of keen interest to us in Illinois. In his recent inaugural address, Governor Thompson said that "We need a pound of prevention" in preserving the future for our children. This statement was part of his reaffirmation of his longstanding committment and support of substance abuse prevention in Illinois.

Both Governor Thompson and Lieutenant Governor George Ryan have agressively supported the need for a comprehensive program of substance abuse prevention targeted at school aged children. The programs and policies that have been developed under their leadership have included requirements that education and skills development begin at the earliest stages and thus school based prevention programs in Illinois are provided in grades K through 12. In addition, they are committed to providing such services and education opportunities to all children in Illinois, and therefore substance abuse prevention and education is made available to both public and private schools.

We are proud of the policies and practices employed in developing these services in Illinois, but the one aspect which we have used and which we feel is central to the success of our efforts is the theme of cooperative planning and implementation which has permeated all of the programs developed in Illinois -- and which will continue as a central theme for implementing the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act.

I believe that the strongest example of the cooperative planning and implementation that I can describe to this Committee is the InTouch program. InTouch stands for the Illinois Network to Organize an Understanding of Community Health. It arose out of bi-partisan legislation and appropriations actions in the Illinois General Assembly. It was signed into law by Governor Thompson and was accompanied by an appropriation which tripled the available funds for school based substance abuse prevention and education programs, and assured that such services would be available statewide.

This program was conceived, planned, and implemented cooperatively between the Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, the Illinois State Board of Education, and the Office of Lt. Governor George Ryan. The statutory requirements call for planning and implementation at both the regional and local community level which involves not only the schools, but also law enforcement, parents, social service agencies, alcoholism and drug abuse treatment providers, businesses, students, and local government. In fact, this 1985 Illinois law bears a striking resemblance to the requirements for coordination and participation by all segments of the community in the bill you passed last fall!

InTouch has now been fully implemented throughout Illinois. To date, more than 1100 schools have receive action funds and have enrolled school teams for training, to list just a few of the accomplishments. The concepts of InTouch are growing to embrace a broad array of alcoholism and substance abuse prevention interests in Illinois, and will be used as the focal point for further development and deployment of resources such as those which flow to Illinois from the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act.

With this information as background, I would now like to share with you the ways in which Illinois will be using the new federal funding for school based programs through the U.S. Department of Education.

Primarily, Governor Thompson has stated that these funds are to be used to augment and enrich the services already being provided in Illinois. Some of the specific examples include the following:

> The discretionary portion of the funding will be used through cooperative programming by the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse and the Illinois Department of State Police. Program models such as DARE, InTouch, and other effective efforts will be implemented through the existing networks in local communities.
>
> Because of InTouch and the existing climate of cooperative planning for substance abuse prevention in Illinois, local school districts are already in position to incorporate the use of the remaining funds.

In short, Illinois will rapidly implement the provisions of the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act. We will put these programs in place, and we are confident that they will succeed because of the substantial framework that already exists for them to thrive and grow.

In order to establish the credibility of this system, we will evaluate the use of federal as well as State funds through both formal evaluation efforts as well a through limited process evaluations on selected pilot programs. Our aim in measuring the success of substance abuse prevention programs is to assure that scarce resources are not wasted, to guarantee that the funds are used in accordance with the purposes intended, and to demonstrate with utmost clarity that the public funds invested in this endeavor were well spent.

In preparing to appear before you here today, staff requested that Illinois provide comment on the impact of the new federal dollars. Let me say first that these dollars are indeed welcome. In 1985, Illinois may a clear statement about its own commitment to "drug free schools and communities" through a tremendously increased commitment of State funds. Nevertheless, these resources are finite, and dollars which will appropriately enrich our efforts are gratefully received.

However, if the reductions in the level of federal support are accepted by the Congress as proposed, I believe that Illinois and no doubt other states as well, will once more be left on our own. It is important to note that what we will acquire with the use of federal funds, just as with State funds, are services. If the support of these services is reduced, the services will have to be curtailed.

Regrettably, the reduction of disappearance of federal support for school based prevention and education programs in substance abuse suggests to us that the federal government does not see it role as a partner with States in dealing with this problem. Rather, the plan to reduce these funds suggests that the federal government has taken a very cynical view of the issue, and perhaps the federal government believes that substance abuse prevention is a one shot, short term solution.

Let me assure you that Illinois does not take this cynical view. Governor Thompson, the Illinois General Assembly, and all of us in Illinois have taken a clear stand. The commitment that Illinois has made, and the commitment that Illinois intends to honor recognizes that substance abuse prevention is an investment in the future. It is an investment in the future of our children and a future that is not ravaged by the devastation of alcohol and drug abuse. We invite the federal government to join us in that commitment.

Again, I thank this Committee for the invitation to appear before you today. I will be happy to respond to any questions that you may have regarding the programs in Illinois or to provide you with any additional information you may need.

NSBA
FEDERAL RELATIONS

Nellie C. Weil
President

Thomas A. Shannon
Executive Director
Michael A. Resnick
Associate Executive Director
Lynne Glassman
Director, Network Operations
Katharine L. Herber
Legislative Counsel
Edward R. Kealy
Director, Federal Programs

TESTIMONY

on behalf of

THE NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

on

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986

before the

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

U. S. House of Representatives
H313 U.S. Capitol

February 26, 1987

Presented by

G. Holmes Braddock
Member, Dade County, Florida
Board of Education

Also present for NSBA:

Thomas A. Shannon
Executive Director

Michael A. Resnick
Associate Executive Director

Dorothy H. Stambaugh
Manager, Urban/Large District Desk

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
1680 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314 / (703) 838-6722
. . . serving American education through school board leadership

I. INTRODUCTION

I am Holmes Braddock, a member of the Dade County, Florida, Board of Education, and immediate past president of the Florida School Boards Association. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Committee about the "Anti-Drug Act of 1986" and the drug abuse education provisions contained in Title IV of the Act (also known as the "Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act"). I am here representing the Dade County Board of Education and the National School Boards Association.

The National School Boards Association is the only major education organization representing local school board members, who have the responsibility of governing the nation's public schools. Throughout the nation, approximately 97,000 of these individuals, representing some 15,000 local school districts, are members of the National School Boards Association. These people, in turn, are responsible for the education of more than 95 percent of the nation's public school children.

Currently marking its forty-seventh year of service, NSBA is a federation of state school board associations, with direct local school board affiliates, constituted to strengthen local lay control of education and to work for the improvement of education. Most of these school board members are elected public officials. Accordingly, they are politically accountable to their constituents for both education policy and fiscal management.

At NSBA's annual convention last April, our representative Delegate Assembly adopted a resolution reconfirming our long-standing concern about substance abuse. The text of the resolution is included as an appendix to my testimony.

Today, I will be speaking about our drug education programming in the Miami area and about the nationwide impact to local districts of the new federal initiative in substance abuse prevention and education.

II. BACKGROUND: THE SEVERITY OF THE PROBLEM

In Dade County, we have more than a quarter million students in our public schools. In many ways, we are a microcosm of America. All of you here today know that there is a drug problem in South Florida -- and in virtually every other school district in the state and nation. Substance abuse, which includes both drugs and alcohol, has a serious impact on all communities in Dade County and throughout the state.

In Florida, alcohol abuse alone costs Floridians $4.9 billion a year. Drug and alcohol abuse costs Florida $7.4 billion or $700 for every man, woman, and child in our state. The following facts, taken from the Governor's Commission on Drug and Alcohol concerns, demonstrate the severity of the problem.

- Youth are Affected

    - One out of six Florida youths report having used cocaine.

    - Twenty percent of high school seniors report using marijuana.

- - Sixty-four percent of all youth arrests are due to the use or abuse of drugs or alcohol.
  - Alcohol-related incidents are the leading cause of death among people ages 16-24.
- Families are Affected
  - It is estimated that 520,000 Floridians have the illness of alcoholism. This is roughly one out of every 20 people.
  - Every alcoholic has a negative impact on four to six others, including family, friends, and co-workers.
  - Thirty-three percent of all reported cases of child abuse are alcohol-related.
  - Twenty-five percent of all suicides in Florida are alcohol-related.
- Health Care Costs are Affected
  - Alcoholism and alcohol abuse may be responsible for up to 15 percent of total health care costs, because alcoholics use significantly greater amounts of medical services for a wide range of physical problems caused by, or associated with, excessive drinking.
- Law Enforcement is Affected

- In 1983, 69,000 Floridians were arrested for driving while under the influence of alcohol. Alcohol was a factor in one-half of the total number of traffic fatalities.

- One hundred fifty tons of cocaine entered the United States through the State of Florida during 1983.

- One out of every four inmates in state prisons was found guilty of either possession, sale, or smuggling illegal drugs.

- In 1983, Florida's arrests for drug law violations (sale and possession) totalled 37,984.

- Over half of Florida's male youth offenders are identified as having severe substance abuse problems.

- Sixty-four percent of all homicides in Florida are related to drug or alcohol abuse.

III. SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMMING IN THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

We know that there are students in our schools who have substance abuse problems. We also know that all students must be educated about the dangers of substance abuse. And we in the local school districts are willing to do our parts. The overwhelming majority of school districts already have recognized the need for substance abuse awareness programming.

The Dade County Public Schools, in addressing this need, provide an extensive substance education program that directs youth away from substance abuse. The elementary curriculum consists of units of study from kindergarten through sixth grade on substance awareness, as well as affective education. In seventh grade science and tenth grade health, THE substance education curriculum is a separate unit of study within the subject curriculum guide.

Students Against Driving Drunk (SADD) has received much publicity in the past two years. It is a part of the Driver Education program in our senior high schools. Students and parents enter into a written reciprocal agreement not to drive while under the influence. The bottom line is to keep our youth alive and healthy.

Project HOPE, a junior high school substance education facilitator program, serves all students in the eighth grade. The program is preventive, with an emphasis on developing within the individuals the ability to make rational decisions, function effectively with peers, and develop a value system which precludes the abuse of mind and body through the use of harmful substances.

The Dade County Public Schools hold in high regard school and community efforts which assist in reaching the goal of a drug-free youth, including working closely with various political organizations, the State Attorney's Office, Health and Rehabilitative Services, local community agencies, Miami Citizens Against Crime, treatment programs, and organizations such an "Informed Families", in setting up prevention/intervention and referral programs that better serve our students and their families.

We are in the process of forming a Substance Education Advisory Council that would be composed of individuals with interest and expertise in substance education. The council would address the need for school and community to unite in the effort to prevent substances abuse. The Dade County School Board began addressing this need by approving funding for Project HELP (Healthy Experiences Leading to Prevention), for the 1986-87 school year.

This program, funded under Chapter 2, ECIA, is currently being implemented in two feeder patterns, including the junior high and elementary schools that feed into the senior high schools. This is a comprehensive program working with all grade levels and the community in an effort to coordinate and complement all existing substance education programs. The program consists of three components: prevention, intervention, and community awareness. Each feeder pattern is assigned one counselor and one community involvement specialist, who provide a number of services including: inservice training to teachers, counselors, and administrators; establishing "Just Say No Clubs", SADD organizations, and task forces; and coordinating other drug prevention activities. These staff persons are also responsible for individual and group counseling sessions, and home visits for students and their families, who have been identified as high-risk. In the feeder patterns where this program is being implemented, substance abuse prevention efforts have developed into a comprehensive substance education program. Therefore, as additional funding becomes available for substance education, these funds would be allocated for the expansion of Project HELP.

IV. THE NEED FOR SUSTAINED FEDERAL FUNDING

In the Dade County Public Schools, there are currently 24 feeder patterns and Project HELP is being implemented in two. There is a tremendous need to expand this program to provide services for all students and their families. However, to provide services for one year and then cut-back on these services would be a serious mistake. The complex nature of the drug problem requires not only time to develop relationships, but also time to establish credibility. With a "cut back" after the first year, there is yet another problem. It will be difficult to attract the quality of individuals necessary if there is no job security provided. Substance abuse programs in general have a reputation as short term "one shot" deals that will not be around for long. There needs to be a commitment to providing ongoing programs that the public will have faith in and respect for.

In order to provide for information on applying for the funds available under the "Anti Drug Abuse Act of 1986", the Florida State Department of Education has scheduled a workshop on March 9-10, 1987. Staff from the Dade County Public Schools plan to attend this workshop and proceed accordingly.

The important thing, as this Committee knows, is that this is not a schools problem. It is a societal problem. And society -- the nation -- should provide some of the funding for anti-drug education. Not that the current appropriation is going to go all that far in substance abuse education -- but it is a meaningful start. It may be the money that sends each child home with materials to be shared with his or her family and picked up and used again at home. It may be the money that provides staff development to make every teacher in a school district more aware of substance abuse and more capable of dealing with it in the classroom. Drug abuse education is not a one-shot deal. When you have educated a fourth grader about substance abuse, you must re-educate the child again in seventh grade and again in high school -- and in between, as well -- if you are going to make a difference. Even our extensive program in Dade County cannot make as significant an impact as we would like without adequate federal financial support. Whether it is staff development, teacher training, materials purchase, community outreach and education, parent involvement, or some other need -- mere seed money is not enough.

The Department of Education's plan to slash substance abuse education and prevention funding is unconscionable. It does not make good educational sense or good economic sense to decrease funding before the first round of money has even reached the localities. At NSBA, the largest expression of interest from local districts in recent memory has been generated by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. There is clearly no lack of interest in substance abuse education. The stumbling block has been funding.

The children are in our schools. Logistically, it makes sense that the schools be the forum in which substance abuse education takes place. But in a nation where the average per-pupil expenditure is under $3,500 and where many school districts are in difficult financial situations, often compounded by the depressed economic condition of their localities, it is not as easy as it may seem to squeeze yet another program into tight budgets.

Not only large urban districts like mine but many small districts in rural areas know they need improved substance abuse education. And they will get to it some day -- after they address some of their other tough issues like modernizing science curricula, honoring the federal mandates in special education, teaching underprivileged children to read and write, removing asbestos from their school buildings -- and getting the voters to fund their budgets. If we want substance abuse education to move up the priority list, there must be federal funds to support it.

V. CONCLUSION

In closing, Mr. Chairman, NSBA and the Dade County Public Schools are committed to reducing and eliminating the abuse of our children's minds and bodies through misuse of drugs and alcohol. I am grateful that the United States Department of Education is providing us with funds to aid us in this battle. The problems associated with substance abuse are not just a school problem. This is why NSBA was pleased to see the enactment of the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act in the 99th Congress -- and particularly pleased that the Act included an education component. To us this signified the recognition of Congress that education is one aspect of a comprehensive federal assault on substance abuse. We urge the Committee to make every effort to sustain the current federal funding level in this critical area.

Appendix: NSBA Resolution

3.3 Abuse of Drugs, Alcohol and/or Other Substances. NSBA urges local school boards and state school boards associations to take initiatives to meet the problems raised by the abuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances.

NSBA urges (1) local school boards and state school boards associations to develop identification and preventive programs; (2) law enforcement agencies to prosecute vigorously wholesalers and pushers of illegal drugs and those who sell alcohol illegally to minors; (3) school boards to cooperate with law enforcement agencies in their responsibility to eliminate illegal drugs from the schools and illegal sale of drugs and alcohol to minors, especially on or near school grounds; (4) Congress and the President to take measures aimed at stopping the influx of illegal drugs into this country; and (5) child welfare and other agencies to address the problem of child alcoholism and drug, tobacco and other substance abuse.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

On Department Activities

For

Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act

Witnesses appearing before the
House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

John P. Walters
Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education

accompanied by

Thomas M. Corwin, Acting Director, Division of Elementary,
Secondary, and Vocational Analysis, Budget Service,
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation

February 26, 1987

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Statement by the Special Assistant to the Secretary

on

Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Education Secretary William Bennett has given me prime responsibility for supervising and coordinating the Department's efforts to prevent drug use in the schools. I am pleased to be here today to speak about our work. This is a matter of enormous importance to Secretary Bennett and, I know, to the Chairman and Members of this Committee; it is also, and above all, a matter of overwhelming importance to the American people. There is nothing more inimical to the nurture and protection of our children and to the mission of our schools than illegal drugs. Student drug use remains at shocking levels; students have begun using drugs at ever younger ages, and the use of especially potent drugs, particularly cocaine, has increased in recent years. But we have begun to make progress in reducing drug use by our children.

As you know, the Reagan Administration has a long-standing record of leadership in combatting illegal drug use throughout our society. In particular, the First Lady has worked tirelessly against drug use by children. Her "Just Say No" campaign is the Nation's foremost program encouraging children to help each other resist drugs.

Eliminating the scourge of drugs from our schools also has been among the chief concerns of Secretary Bennett since he took office nearly two years ago. There is no issue about which he feels more strongly. In his first interview as Secretary, when asked what one thing he would most like to do for our Nation's schools, Secretary Bennett responded that, if he could, he would get drugs out of our schools and out of our children, immediately. As most of the Members of this Committee know, during his tenure, Secretary Bennett has met with parents, teachers, principals, and law enforcement officers all across this country to discuss what can be done to prevent student drug use.

What can be done to combat drug use by our children? Students should be taught that the use of drugs is wrong and harmful -- to them and to our Nation. We should work to ensure that students also receive a strong anti-drug message through the media and from fellow students. But a look at the schools and communities that have succeeded in beating drugs indicates that the single most important factor is the effort, the diligence, the responsibility, and the perseverance of those at the local level: of parents, teachers, principals, the police, and other members of the community of responsible adults. Drug education can be an important ally in the campaign against drug use, but there is no course, no new book or video, that can replace tough school drug policies that are fairly and rigorously enforced. There is no substitute for a powerful message, conveyed and enforced by adults, that drug use will not be tolerated.

There are several ways in which the Department of Education is helping to get drugs out of schools.

Last March, Secretary Bennett announced that the Department would prepare a guide to effective drug prevention programs in our schools. In September, the Department followed through on that commitment, releasing Schools Without Drugs, a how-to guide to overcoming student drug use. It is based on the research of drug prevention experts, and on the experience of schools, parent groups, and law enforcement officials working at drug prevention across the country.

Ernest Furgurson of the Baltimore Sun called Schools Without Drugs "the single most effective weapon" in the fight against drugs. He wrote: "This is the first time in 18 years of column writing that I have plugged a government handout this way. I may never do it again. This manual is an extraordinary public service."

Educators have also welcomed Schools Without Drugs. Sam Sava, Executive Director of the National Association of

Elementary School Principals, has said it will be "enormously helpful" to principals. And Scott Thomson, Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, has told us that this book is "exactly what's needed."

But most important of all, the American people have welcomed this book. A school bus driver called for copies because she wanted to give it to every child on her bus. A disc jockey requested a copy because he wanted to read sections over the air between records. A ten-year-old called and asked for ten copies because, he said, he doesn't want drugs in his school. Grandparents, counselors, nurses, ministers, mayors -- all kinds of people are asking for copies. And the administrators at the places Schools Without Drugs talks about -- places like Northside High School in Atlanta and the Anne Arundel County District in Maryland -- tell us that they are getting dozens of calls from other school officials who want to replicate their successes.

We have distributed over a million copies of Schools Without Drugs in just over five months. And it has proved to be the second most popular government publication in the history of the Federal government's Consumer Information Center in Colorado.

On February 5th, Secretary Bennett announced the beginning of a follow-up program to Schools Without Drugs called "Schools

Without Drugs: The Challenge." This is a program to assist parents, schools, students and communities in putting the principles set forth in the book to work for their own schools.

The purpose of the program is to help schools and communities mobilize their efforts. We will be publishing a drug newsletter that will provide descriptions of model anti-drug programs and the best available practical research on prevention. We will give advice to interested groups on which methods and techniques might be best for them. And we'll be keeping track of how schools are solving their problems so we can get the word out to other schools in the "Challenge" program. All of this is in line with our belief that one of the best ways the Federal government can help schools is to help them learn from the experience of others nationwide.

This program is in keeping with something else we've learned about how good education works, namely: What matters most is the effort made at the local level. In this respect, we are extremely encouraged that we have fourteen major educational, parent, and law enforcement organization standing behind this program. These are national associations, but their memberships are directly involved with schools and communities all over the country. An invitation to join the "Challenge" campaign and a brochure describing the program have been mailed to every elementary, middle, and high school in the Nation.

Last year, the Administration also proposed $100 million for the Department of Education to assist in school-based drug prevention efforts. Following enactment of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act last September, the Department has made special efforts to make the new funds the Act provided available to the States as quickly as possible. In January, Secretary Bennett and I, along with other Department officials, met with school board members, governors' representatives, and representatives of State educational agencies to brief them on the requirements governing the use of the funds, the proposed nonregulatory guidance drafted by the Department, and on the ways our research indicates those funds can be employed most effectively. Funds will begin going to the States next Monday, March 2nd.

For fiscal year 1988, we have asked the Congress for $100 million for Drug-Free Schools -- the same amount requested last year. There are several reasons why we requested $100 million for this program in FY 1988. It is partly a question of available resources, and partly a question of responsible use of resources. We anticipate that much of the $200 million appropriated in FY 1987 will be used during school year 1987-88 for start-up costs, including non-recurring activities such as the purchase of equipment and instructional materials. The Secretary has made the early release of these funds a top priority within the Department. However, since this is a new program and States and localities will require a certain amount of lead time to implement their activities, we also anticipate that they will actually carry over a considerable portion of the $200 million to the 1988-89 school year. Therefore, we believe our 1988 request of $100 million will be sufficient to continue these programs in school year 1988-89.

We also believe strongly that continued funding should be contingent upon demonstrated results. In fact, this principle was an important component of the Administration's proposed anti-drug legislation. In light of this, we hope that the Congress will consider adding some of the original requirements governing the distribution of funds contained in last year's Administration proposal. We must remember that no matter how much money we spend, no drug education program will be successful unless it goes hand-in-hand with tough enforcement policies in the schools. It is those policies that will demonstrate to our Nation's youth that we are genuinely committed to ridding our schools of drugs.

As is apparent in Schools Without Drugs and in the research on which it is based, the key ingredient in drug prevention is not funds, nor a lot of specially designed local projects and programs. In order to fight drugs effectively, most school districts do not need a lot of additional texts and teachers, class time or class space; what they need is information, coordination, and determination. They need the attentiveness and forcefulness of those already charged with the nurture and protection of our children: of parents, teachers, principals, and community leaders. Creating schools without drugs means parents teaching clear standards of right and wrong; it means supervising children's activities; parents keeping in touch with one another, and schools keeping in touch with parents; it means schools themselves setting clear and specific rules, and consistently enforcing them.

These are the fundamentals of drug prevention. They are not difficult; they are not expensive. But they are essential, and I believe that the most important contribution to be made by a Federal act intended to help schools beat drugs is to ensure that communities know the importance of teaching clear standards of right and wrong to students and buttressing these standards with tough policies that are rigorously enforced.

Let's ask that districts receiving funds first assess the extent of their drug problem, and then set goals for eliminating it. Let's ask that, before receiving Federal funds a second or third year, they demonstrate substantial progress toward those goals. And let us ensure that firm rules, consistent enforcement, and community involvement are part and parcel of the programs receiving funding under the Act. No matter how much money we spend, we are unlikely to have any effect unless these things are done. For this reason, the Administration believes that ensuring that we spend wisely should be a greater priority, at this point, than simply ensuring that we spend a lot.

Allow me to mention, briefly, some of the other things that Secretary Bennett and the Education Department are doing to help schools and communities prevent student drug use.

The Department administers an alcohol and drug abuse education program through its Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Since 1976, this program has funded prevention efforts that foster a "school team approach." Typically, a team consisting of school administrators, teachers, and parents or community members submits a proposal for prevention efforts and receives training at one of five regional training centers funded under the Department's program. The program has trained over 5000 teams and a more than 19,000 individuals. We are now completing a study of these five regional centers. And we plan to make improvements, if they are needed, in the expanded operation of the regional centers program authorized by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

The Department is also developing the necessary regulatory guidance to implement the program for higher education and teacher training authorized in the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. We are working expeditiously to see that funds will be available for projects that will operate in the 1987-88 school year. We are also developing a series of practical research priorities that will assist in getting drugs out of our schools. Funds for these activities will be funded under the "Federal Activities" section of the Act.

Finally, this March, we will announce a grant program under the Federal Activities authority of the Act that will help schools that have accurately assessed their own drug problems institute drug prevention programs of their own design, consistent with the principles I listed previously.

Let me conclude with this point. There are some who have characterized the nation's concern over drugs as a matter of recent media hype, a fabrication by "media melodrama." They have suggested that this concern, with the front page stories, has slipped slowly away.

But those who believe this are mistaken. In 1985, when students age 13 to 18 were asked by the Gallup Poll to identify the biggest problems currently confronting young people, drugs topped their list. For several years running the American people have identified drug use as one of the two or three most serious problems facing our schools. And this summer, in the 1986 Gallup Poll on education, drug use was for the first time identified as the number one problem facing the Nation's schools. In a recent poll by U.S. News and World Report, Americans identified drugs --

not any of the other issues currently playing big in the media -- as the most important issue to be faced by the Nation in 1987.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe that Congress and the Administration are united in our intention to remove drugs from our schools; and in this we are united as well with the American people. I hope we can rely on your help as we work toward achieving a drug-free future for our children.

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

ASAPT

AMERICANS FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT
National Headquarters
400 First Street, NW
Suite 712
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 347-7878
(800) 255-2727

Advisory Committee

George Gallup, Jr.
Pollster
Honorary Chairman
Pat Boone
Entertainer
Joseph A. Califano, Jr.
Attorney
Hon. Herman E. Talmadge
Former U.S. Senator
Abigail Van Buren
Syndicated Columnist
Raymond Chavira
Board Member
California Council on Alcohol Problems
Michael E. De Bakey, M.D.
Heart Specialist
Hon. Wilbur D. Mills
Attorney
Ernest P. Noble, Ph.D., M.D.
Director, Alcohol Research, UCLA
Sue Rusche
Director, Families in Action
Jokichi Takamine, M.D.
Chairman, AMA Committee
on Alcoholism
Dale P. Dirks
Treasurer

Statement of

The Americans for Substance Abuse Prevention
and Treatment

before the

Select Narcotics Committee
U.S. House of Representatives

on

Drug Abuse Education Programs

February 26, 1987

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to present testimony on drug abuse education programs. The Americans for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (ASAPT) is an organization representing 20,000 parents, nurses, physicians, and other individuals working together to address the dangerous problems of drug abuse among our nation's youth. We are relieved that Congress passed, and the President signed, the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 and that this law authorizes funds for drug education programs.

For many years, there has been a critical need for increased and improved drug education programs in this country. We know this from our experiences working with youth. We see first-hand the importance of teaching these children the dangers of drug use and the various myths associated with particular illicit drugs.

Drug education programs have been successful, and with sufficient resources and funding, these programs can continue to be successful. Obviously, we recognize that not all drug education programs will prevent all youth from using or continuing to use drugs. We have also heard the charge that teaching a person about drugs will only give that person more knowledge to further pursue drugs. However, the Americans for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment is not familiar with any programs in which this has been the case. Further, we believe that if this has happened, it has occurred in only a very limited number of circumstances, and that the success from such programs far outweighs any single unfortunate experience. It is also important to note that there is no evidence to support the case that knowledge of drugs will cause an individual to use drugs. Rather, drug education programs have been instrumental in teaching youth the hazards and consequences of drug use.

As you know, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 authorizes $200 million for education programs in FY1987 and $250 million annually in FY1988 and FY1989. However, the Administration's budget request would significantly reduce funding for these programs by providing a total of only $100 million for FY1988. This situation is of grave concern to ASAPT, and we urge Congress to reject any attempts to diminish these programs.

Finally, with regard to the programs to be funded under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986, the Americans for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment urges expansion and improvement of existing school programs that have shown to be successful. We believe this is necessary, in order to make the best use of the funds available and to make the best programs as effective as possible and available to as many youth as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the Americans for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment believes that drug abuse education is vital to efforts aimed at solving this national epidemic. We also believe that this trend can only be reversed by a comprehensive national strategy, which includes drug education, as well as drug prevention and treatment programs.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present our views.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY

FROM

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ON

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986

TO

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Room H2-234, House Office Building, Annex 2
Washington, D.C. 20515

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) is the non-profit membership organization representing state boards of education. NASBE provides vital programs and services for some 600 state board members, attorneys, and executives in 47 states and U.S. territories. These state boards directly influence the education of some 40 million public school children in the United States.

State boards of education play a critical role in addressing today's education challenges. They establish certification standards for teachers and administrators, set high school graduation requirements, define performance standards for students and schools, adopt textbooks, review and approve state education budgets, and develop rules and regulations for a variety of state programs.

State boards do not act alone: they interact with the chief state school officer, the legislature, the governor, local constituents, and state level associations of administrators, teachers, and school boards. Through their policy development and adoption process, and by virtue of their relationship with the state legislature, state boards determine the tone, direction, and quality of education in their states.

Created in 1959 with an initial membership of eleven states, NASBE now has a membership composed of the state boards of education in 46 states and five U.S. territories. It is a dynamic and effective association representing state boards as they promote quality education in the states and strengthen the tradition of lay control of American public schools.

In 1981, NASBE instituted the Alcohol Education Guidelines Project. One of the goals of this project is to help state boards enact policies addressing the problem of alcohol abuse by our youth. Since that time we have developed written materials for state boards, such as the report Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Education: Survey of the States, completed in mid-October of 1986. We have disseminated model policies and provided technical assistance to state boards of education.

Project staff collaborate with national organizations and agencies in promoting comprehensive substance abuse prevention education based on teaching our youth knowledge, attitudes and skills enabling them to make responsible decisions. NASBE also maintains a resource service to respond to information requests from individuals, schools, and community organizations, about comprehensive alcohol and drug education and prevention programs.

COMMENTS ON PUBLIC LAW 99-570

II. COORDINATION, COLLABORATION AND FUNDING

NASBE is deeply appreciative of the fact that Congress passed this important legislation. The emphasis on a systems-wide approach has long been advocated by NASBE. Coordination of efforts at all societal levels is a crucial element in reversing the tide of substance use and abuse by our youth, and we applaud the foresight of Congress in addressing this issue in the new law.

In the final section of the aforementioned survey report, NASBE made a series of recommendation to state boards of education about enacting policies to:

- Mandate substance abuse education in grades K-12;
- Require pre-service and annual in-service training for teachers and administrators;
- Require addition of health educators/prevention educators in the state education agencies with the sole task of providing technical assistance to local education agencies and schools;
- Provide a range of funding options to develop programs and train personnel;
- Institute statewide education program evaluation; and
- Direct state education agencies to seek out or respond to opportunities to collaborate with other state level agencies and groups.

Each of the recommendations NASBE made to state boards of education appear in Subtitle B, Title IV, of the Omnibus Anti Drug Abuse Act of 1986 which was gratifying. Implementation of each of these recommendations will require substantial funding. NASBE strongly urges the vigorous defense of funding levels proposed by the Congress for each of the years covered by the law. If Congress expects to completely involve the nation's education system in turning our youth away from substance abuse, then the proposed funding levels must be maintained, if not substantially increased.

Annual in-service training for teachers and administrators for improving substance abuse prevention education delivery and developing early intervention skills requires stable funding. The same is true of increasing the number of state education agency personnel to provide technical assistance to local education agencies. And most certainly, if state education agencies are to develop systems to annually evaluate the effectiveness of education/prevention programs (Sec. 4123 b.(8), State Applications), multi-year stable funding is mandated.

THE ROLE OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Section 4122 (a)(5) suggests the development of a broadly representative state advisory council to include members of the state board of education. This was the only time in the "Drug Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986" that state boards of education were mentioned. NASBE believes it is vitally important for the Congress to recognize that some state boards of education have exercised powerful leadership roles in adopting policy to institute just such programs as those specified under Title IV. It is regrettable that a specific section of this Act did not acknowledge this action and encourage every state board of education to enact such policies. By addressing a large portion of the Act to state education agencies, Congress has acknowledged the vital role of program administration, but overlooked the importance of state level education policymaking. In every state, these public bodies, state boards of education and state education agencies, are the combination that plan for, regulate, advocate, implement, evaluate, and take corrective action relating to state-wide education. NASBE recommends that any revisions to the Act include a section that fills in this unfortunate gap and acknowledges the vital leadership role played by the volunteer lay citizens that occupy public policymaking positions on state boards of education nationwide. State boards of education have a stake in, and potential for, assisting in achieving "drug free schools and communities."

NASBE appreciates the opportunity to submit this written testimony to the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

[illegible]

CHARLES B. RANGEL, NEW YORK
CHAIRMAN

PETER W. RODINO, JR., NEW JERSEY
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, CALIFORNIA
JAMES H. SCHEUER, NEW YORK
CARDISS COLLINS, ILLINOIS
DANIEL K. AKAKA, HAWAII
FRANK J. GUARINI, NEW JERSEY
ROBERT T. MATSUI, CALIFORNIA
DANTE B. FASCELL, FLORIDA
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, NEW JERSEY
MEL LEVINE, CALIFORNIA
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, TEXAS
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, FLORIDA
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, NEW YORK

U.S. House of Representatives
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL
ROOM H2-234, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ANNEX 2
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6425

COMMITTEE PHONE 202-226-3040

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, NEW YORK
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, PENNSYLVANIA
E. CLAY SHAW, JR., FLORIDA
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, OHIO
STAN PARRIS, VIRGINIA
DUNCAN HUNTER, CALIFORNIA
JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI, NEW YORK
STEWART B. McKINNEY, CONNECTICUT
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., WISCONSIN
ROBERT K. DORNAN, CALIFORNIA

EDWARD H. JURITH
STAFF DIRECTOR
ELLIOTT A. BROWN
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

April 22, 1987

The Honorable William J. Bennett
Secretary of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Room 4181
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am in the process of reviewing the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Amendments of 1987 which you have proposed and Representative Charles Bennett has introduced (H.R.1752). This legislation would amend title IV, subtitle B of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986. There are provisions in the bill about which I have some concern. I would appreciate your comments.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 directs the Department of Education to identify research and development priorities with regard to school-based drug abuse education and prevention. H.R. 1752 would amend section 4132 (b) (5) of the Act to permit the Department of Education to carry out research and development activities in this area, too.

The 1986 legislation reflects the view of Congress that additional drug abuse prevention and education research is needed. To achieve this objective, Congress directed the Education Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), to identify research priorities. This cooperation was mandated because the Department of Education is the Federal link to our nation's schools and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), within HHS, is the Federal Government's drug abuse research agency. The Congress wanted to assure that the expertise of both agencies would be combined in a coordinated effort to develop these research priorities.

I do not understand, however, why the Department of Education is seeking authority to conduct this research. NIDA has extensive experience and expertise in all phases of drug abuse research, including drug abuse prevention and education research. The agency has a strong intramural research program and draws from a distinguished pool of researchers to carry out an ambitious extramural research effort. The additional research monies included in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act for NIDA also have stimulated increased interest in drug abuse research. NIDA is receiving more high quality research proposals from a greater number of well-qualified researchers.

I believe NIDA is the appropriate agency to carry out drug abuse prevention and education research. To try to duplicate within the Department of Education the professional research capability of NIDA would be wasteful and could lead to a fragmented, uncoordinated Federal drug abuse research program. The Department of Education should use its special expertise on schools to work with NIDA to identify drug education research priorities, but I urge you to reconsider your request for research authority.

The proposed amendments also require local applicants to describe in detail the nature and extent of drug and alcohol abuse in their schools including: the number or percentage of students who use drugs or alcohol; the grade level of these students; the types of drugs they use; and how this information was obtained. To strengthen accountability under the Act, each local applicant would be required to submit a progress report to the State educational agency on the first two years of its plan outlining significant accomplishments and the extent to which there has been a reduction in the number of students who use drugs and alcohol. A local applicant's third-year funding would be contingent on the State agency's determination that the applicant is making reasonable progress toward achieving the goals of its plan or that the applicant has modified its plan to provide reasonable assurance of such progress.

These proposed changes raise a number of concerns. First, the type of information on student drug use an applicant would be required to submit with its application is not readily available in most local school districts. Local schools would have to collect this data.

Second, requiring local schools to collect the detailed data envisioned under the amendments would be expensive. It is quite conceivable that it would cost a local applicant more money to design a data collection instrument and collect and analyze the data than the applicant would receive under the Act. I cannot understand how the Administration can propose this requirement and at the same time recommend a 50 percent reduction in 1988 from current program funds.

Third, in addition to added costs, local applicants will confront other difficulties in gathering such data. Legal concerns may be raised about protecting the confidentiality of data collected. At a minimum, parental consent would be required to collect such data. Additional staff also would be needed to collect and analyze the data. The length of time to collect such data, particularly the initial data collection effort, could significantly delay a school's application for funding.

Fourth, the proposed legislation provides no guidance to schools as to how they should go about collecting these data.

Without any standards to follow, the information collected would not be uniform, and comparisons would be meaningless. The reliability of the data also would be extremely suspect.

In short, the benefits of the proposed data collection requirement seem marginal at best and are heavily outweighed by the costs. Rather than facilitating the establishment of school-based drug abuse education programs, this requirement would be more likely to deter schools from applying for Federal assistance.

The data collection problems are compounded by the apparent intent to make a local applicant's continued eligibility for Federal funds contingent primarily upon a showing of decreased student drug use. Even if such data could be collected, two years is not adequate to establish trends. More importantly, when Congress passed the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986, it recognized that the epidemic of student drug abuse in this country has been decades in the making and will not be reversed in one, two, or even three years. The funding Congress provided last year for drug abuse education is only an initial commitment. If we are to have any hope of changing student attitudes and drug-taking behavior, we must be prepared to make a continuing, long-term drug abuse prevention and education effort in our schools.

I share your desire to make schools accountable for the effectiveness of their programs. If we are to hold them strictly accountable, however, we need to provide them with effective models. I believe the Department of Education has a strong responsibility to identify and develop specific curricula and other programs that work, to disseminate these models to State and local school agencies, and to provide the technical support and assistance for schools to implement these strategies. We need a positive, not a punitive, approach to drug abuse education.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL
Chairman

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

June 5, 1987

Honorable Charles B. Rangel
Chairman
Select Committee on Narcotics
  Abuse and Control
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515-6425

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing in response to your letter of April 22, in which you list a number of questions. I met with your staff on May 7 to answer these questions, and this letter is a follow up. I have addressed your questions, in order, in the attachments. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

William J. Lennox, Jr.
Special Assistant to the Secretary

Attachments

Questions

1. Please provide to the Committee a copy of the Department's final nonregulatory guidelines governing the new State and local grant program. Please indicate when these guidelines were finally issued and to whom they were distributed. Were there guidelines published in the Federal register?

2. Under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, $8.8 million was provided for the regional centers for fiscal year 1987. Another $3 million for fiscal year 1987 was appropriated for the centers in the continuing resolution, but we understand the Department plans to reprogram these funds. How do you propose to use the reprogrammed amount?

3. In your written testimony, you said the Department was completing a study of the five existing regional centers and would make improvements, if needed, in the operation of the expanded regional centers program authorized by the Act.

a. Please provide a copy of your study to the Committee.

b. Please inform the Committee of any improvements you plan to make in the centers' operations as a result of your study.

c. Please provide a description of the expanded activities the centers will perform.

d. In many hearings the Select Committee has held in Washington and around the country, we have received strong support for the "school team approach" the centers have fostered. How does the Department plan to integrate this successful program into the expanded operations of the regional centers?

4. The funding table provided to the Committee which shows the distribution of 1987 funds under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act indicates that $6,307,500 is allocated to discretionary activities at the Federal level.

a. Please provide a description of the individual activities, programs or projects that will be conducted with these funds and the amount allocated for each activity, program or project.

b. In particular, please elaborate on the grant program you mentioned in your written testimony that will fund model school-based drug prevention programs. What is the status of this program? Has the Department issued any regulations or other guidance on this program? How many grants do you envision? How much will be available per grant? What criteria will an applicant be required to meet to be eligible for funds? How will these programs be evaluated, and how will the successful models be disseminated?

5. What steps will the Department take to evaluate the State and local programs funded under the Act to determine what works and what does not? Will the Department be using any of its funds for program evaluation in order to determine what works? If so, how much has been allocated for evaluation?

6. Will the Department assist State and local education agencies in the collection of any data that may be needed to assess the impact of drug education programs on student drug use?

7. Last year the Department developed the booklet, What Works, Schools Without Drugs, as a guide to schools in implementing effective measures to eliminate drugs from schools.

a. This booklet identifies a number of specific school programs as examples of successful drug abuse prevention efforts. What evaluations did the Department rely on in determining that these programs are effective? Please provide the Committee with copies of these evaluations.

b. What initiatives, in addition to this booklet, will you be taking under the new Act to provide Federal leadership in developing and disseminating information to State and local school agencies on effective drug abuse education programs?

8. What efforts is the Department making to develop model drug abuse education curricula or criteria for such curricula? Similarly, what is the Department doing to screen or analyze existing curricula and to disseminate the results of your assessments to State and local school agencies to guide them in selecting appropriate materials?

9. The Act mandates cooperation between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services to provide information on drug abuse education. What efforts have been undertaken to carry out this mandate?

10. What initiatives have you undertaken to ensure that teachers have access to the materials available from the new substance abuse clearinghouse that will be established in the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention in HHS?

11. The Act mandates that the Department, in conjunction with the HHS Department, identify research and development priorities with regard to school-based drug abuse education, with particular emphasis on the needs of younger children.

a. To date, what research needs has the Department identified?

b. How are you working with HHS to coordinate research priorities?

Question 1. I provided a copy of the Department's non-regulatory guidance to your staff on May 7. The Department issued the final nonregulatory guidance on February 27 to the governors and chief state school officers (CSSOs). Drafts were earlier circulated to governors and CSSOs on December 29, 1986 and to key staff members identified by the governors and CSSOs on December 30, 1986. A new draft based on state comments was discussed in detail by State and Department representatives at the Department's Conference on Drug-Free Schools January 25 and 26. The Department issued final guidance based on state input on February 27. The Department did not publish the guidance in the Federal Register since it contacted the intended audience through direct mailing.

Question 2. The Chapter 2 funds were appropriated for activities formerly authorized by the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act and were originally intended for the regional centers. The Department will use the funds for disseminating information about drug use, including establishing a system for collecting information on model school programs, supporting the printing of Schools Without Drugs and the Department's new newsletter, offsetting some of the expenses of the January Conference on Drug-Free Schools, funding The Challenge campaign, and providing information on "crack" to all schools. In addition, the Department will fund a school recognition program for model drug prevention programs and conduct an evaluation of the five regional centers.

Question 3. The Department is currently conducting a study of the five regional centers. The report will be available in approximately one month. The Department plans to make changes in the way the centers operate based on the initial findings of the study and based on the law. The Department will use cooperative agreements to administer the regional centers, rather than contracts or grants. The agreements will allow the centers a great deal of flexibility, but will more deeply involve the Department in the centers' prevention efforts. Under the new law, the centers will work more closely with SEAs, LEAs and institutions of higher education (IHEs). This cooperation has the potential for helping states establish their own centers, thus multiplying the current effects of the program. The centers will expand their assistance to LEAs and IHEs to include preservice and inservice training for educational personnel and they will expand their activities related to program evaluation and dissemination. The school team approach will remain an integral part of the program.

Question 4. Besides the $500,000 designated for the clearinghouse, the Department plans to spend the discretionary funds on the $5 million grant program, on supporting the work for the mandated report to Congress and the President, on establishing criteria for drug prevention curricula, on funding studies on the school drug problem, and on coordinating a network of drug-free college campuses. Regulations and an application package have been published for the grant program. The regulations were given to your staff on May 8 and include the specifics on the program. The closing date for applications is June 24, and the Department will make awards in September. There will be 30-50 grants in the $25,000-$200,000 range. The Department will use its centers and the newsletter to disseminate successful programs.

Questions 5 and 6. The Department will begin closely monitoring the program in the fall. The Department is also considering studying the legality and feasibility of a much broader evaluation that would examine state efforts under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Issues to be addressed would include: how States and localities are planning for and implementing the new program; how legislative requirements for interagency and intergovernmental coordination are being carried out; what kinds of activities the Governors are carrying out with their 30 percent of the funds; what portion of the funds are being used to support curricula (and what kinds of curricula); and how the various drug abuse prevention activities are being coordinated within States -- for example between State educational agencies and alcohol and drug abuse prevention agencies.

This study could be a continuation of the Department's effort done in the preparation of its report to the President and Congress and would be a starting point for further investigation into successful programs and procedures. Information would be disseminated through the regional centers, the clearinghouse, and the Department's newsletter.

In addition, the regional centers will have the responsibility of training staff in States and local educational agencies to evaluate their own programs as well as to evaluate others in the marketplace to find programs suited to their environments.

Question 7. In preparation for publishing Schools Without Drugs, the Department looked at many schools over a 6 month period. The evaluations for the schools chosen are attached.

In addition to Schools Without Drugs, the Department is doing a great deal to develop and disseminate information to State and school agencies. The Challenge campaign, the newsletter, the regional centers, the school recognition program, and the curricula board either are or will be gathering information on successful school programs. The Department will rely on the centers, the newsletter, and the clearinghouse to disseminate information on the model programs we receive.

Question 8. In the past, the role of the Department in the development of curricular materials has been small, limited by historical understandings about the proper Federal role in education as well as by Congressional prohibitions such as those expressed in section 432 of the General Education Provisions Act and section 103 of the Department of Education Organization Act. The Department understands the need in our schools for information that will assist in the development and use of better, more effective curricular materials. Therefore, the Department has taken several steps to address this need. First, the Department provided information on effective school-based drug prevention efforts in its publication Schools Without Drugs. The section of the book entitled "Teaching about Drug Prevention" provides specific curricular information. Additional sources of information are included at the end of Schools Without Drugs.

The Department has also provided information about effective prevention efforts, including curricula, through "The Challenge" newsletter, the bimonthly publication sent to all schools. The current issue contains an article by a National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth researcher on criteria to assist in evaluating curricula designed to prevent drug use.

In addition, we are currently developing the specifications for a project to establish criteria for evaluating K-12 substance abuse curricula. Drawing upon research and practice, the Department's staff will produce a guide for school personnel who are responsible for designing and implementing substance abuse programs for schools. This guide will be released during the 1988-89 school year.

Question 9. In December 1986, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education established an ad hoc committee to oversee drug activities. The departments have met monthly to discuss and coordinate programs. In the course of this work two memoranda of agreement were signed, and eight task forces established to coordinate efforts in the areas of curricula, inservice training, reports, research, media, newsletters, colleges and universities, and the clearinghouse. Since March, both departments have become members of the National Drug Policy Board, and thus have coordinated efforts under the Coordinating Group on Drug Prevention and Health.

Question 10. The memorandum of agreement specifies that the clearinghouse will buy drug prevention materials, including printed and audiovisual products, and make them available to schools. The clearinghouse will also respond to specific requests from schools. The Department has recently provided the clearinghouse with its "crack" posters for distribution, and has advertised the clearinghouse as a source of drug prevention information in the Department's bimonthly newsletter. The Department of Education also envisions that the expanded regional centers will both provide information to, and receive information from, the clearinghouse.

Question 11. The Department of Education presented to the Department of Health and Human Services a prevention research agenda in early March. The agenda was based on the Department's work in the preparation of Schools Without Drugs and on a meeting of teachers, principals, school board members, and professionals from the medical, social science and educational fields sponsored by the Department in the summer of 1986. A research task force has the responsibility of coordinating efforts between the two departments in this area. The Departments of Education and Health and Human Services are sharing the results of research studies on prevention programs and strategies for use in the study of Federal, State, and local programs mandated by the Congress in Section 4132(d) of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. The agenda provides an ongoing basis for discussion and collaboration between the two agencies. Of the items included in the agenda, Health and Human Services has under consideration a survey of drug use at the junior high school level and is actively involved in parental training programs.

Evaluation Data - Programs Profiled in Schools Without Drugs

Operation SPECDA

- 154 schools participated in the education component of the program. 744 classes and 23,000 students were involved in SPECDA.

- As a result of the program, students were more aware of the risks of drug abuse, according to a 4/85 evaluation. They also had very positive attitudes toward SPECDA police officers.

- As a result of the enforcement component of the program, 7499 arrests were made, 66 percent of which were in the vicinity of elementary schools. $1.4 million worth of narcotics were seized.

Project DARE

Information on 1984-85 school year:

- 110 elementary schools and 10 junior high schools participated.
- 153,300 students were involved in the program.
- 4340 elementary teachers and 1616 junior high teachers participated in DARE training sessions.
- 243 parent meetings/classes were held and were attended by 30,165 parents.

Findings from surveys of teachers, principals and parents on the effectiveness of the DARE program include the following:

- Students had more negative attitudes toward smoking, drinking and drug use as a result of participation.
- Students had more positive attitudes toward police officers.
- Before participating in DARE, 39 percent of parents disagreed with a statement that parents can't do much about their children's drug use. After DARE, 95 percent disagreed, a 56 percent increase.

Anne Arundel School District

- After implementing the new drug education program, Anne Arundel experienced a 58 percent decline in drug offenses between 1979-80 and 1984-85.

Northside High School

- Drug use declined drastically and academic achievement soared between 1977-78 and 1984-85.
  - Drug-related incidents declined from daily occurrences to approximately 3 a year.
  - Both SAT scores and achievement scores have risen every year since 1977-78. The school is one of the top 2 in the district.

Eastside High School

- Prior to 1982, drugs were sold and used in the school on a daily basis. Gangs of students roamed the hallways armed with razors and knives. Currently, there is no evidence of drug use in the school. School gangs have been eliminated and the hallways are safe.
- In 1981-82, 56 percent of the 9th graders passed the basic skills test in math, as compared to 91 percent in 1984-85.
- In 1981-82, 40 percent of the 9th graders passed the basic skills test in reading, as compared to 67 percent in 1984-85.

Greenway Middle School

- Between 1979-80 and 1984-85, there was a 78 percent reduction in the number of drug and alcohol-related incidents and a 62 percent decline in the number of discipline referrals.

Samuel Gompers High School

- In the late 1970's, police were called to the school daily for drug-related incidents. Drugs were sold and used inside the school and on school grounds. Seven major drug dealers were identified among the school's students.
- By the mid-1980's, 99 percent of all drug sales were eliminated. No students have been caught using or selling drugs over the last several years. In 1985 there were no known incidents of students using alcohol or drugs in school.
- The percentage of students reading at or above grade level increased from 45 percent in 1979-80 to 67 percent in 1984-85.

○